

THE  
CHRISTIAN  
REMEMBRANCER.

FEBRUARY, 1825. |

---

*THE LIFE OF BISHOP HOOPER\*.*

JOHN HOOPER was born in Somersetshire, in the year 1495. Of his parentage, and early life, previous to his entrance at the University of Oxford, no particulars are known. Nor is it even stated positively at what college he was admitted—but it is probable at Merton, under the tuition of his uncle, John Hooper, who was a Fellow of that college, and Principal of Alban Hall. The year 1514 is assigned as the date of his admission. In 1518, he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts, but does not appear to have proceeded to any higher degree. He is supposed, indeed, then to have left Oxford, and to have entered into the Order of Cistercian Monks, in which he continued some time, but at length conceiving a disgust for the monastic life, returned to the University. The writings of Bullinger and Zuinglius began then to attract his notice. To these he devoted himself with an entire zeal, and, as he speaks of himself in a letter to Bullinger, “with a sort of superstitious diligence.” And thus being carried forward to a more accurate study and knowledge of the Scriptures, he became a convert to Protestantism. This change of his sentiments of course rendered him obnoxious to the adherents of superstition, and exposed him to danger from their active exertions against him. When the Act of the Six Articles therefore passed in the year 1539, he found it necessary to leave the University and seek an asylum in the country. He was received into the house of Sir Thomas Arundel, a Devonshire gentleman, to whom he became both chaplain and steward.

Here he recommended himself greatly to the favour of his Patron, who, though a Papist, yet did not withdraw his regard for him, even upon discovering, as he afterwards did, that the religious principles of Hooper were opposed to his own. So anxious, indeed, was Sir Thomas Arundel still to retain him in his service, that he endeavoured to reclaim him to the Roman Church, by sending him to the Bishop of Winchester with some message, and at the same time writing privately to the Bishop, and requesting that he would confer with Hooper on the

\* See Fox's Acts and Monuments; Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography, Vol. 2. p. 427; Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, Vol. 1. p. 91; Clark's Marrow of Ecclesiastical History; Life of Hooper, p. 221; Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, 8vo. Vol. 1. p. 302; Burnet's History of the Reformation, Book 4. Part 2.

subject of religion—but at any rate send him home to him again. In consequence of this, the Bishop of Winchester held a conference with Hooper for four or five days successively, and finding that he could make no impression on him, sent him back to Sir Thomas Arundel with great commendations of his learning, but ever after bearing a secret grudge against him.

Nor was it long before he felt the effects of the displeasure which he had provoked. He was warned by some private friends that there were underhand workings designed for his ruin, and was obliged therefore to provide for his safety, by flying his country. To effect his escape, he borrowed a horse of a person (whose life he had saved a little before from the gallows,) and took his journey to the sea-side, where he embarked for France. Reaching Paris, he fixed his residence there, but remained only a short time, and then returned to England, obtaining the protection of a gentleman named Sentlow. Still he could find no resting-place in his own country,—but being again exposed to danger from the machinations of his enemies, he was compelled once more to consult his safety by flight. Assuming the disguise of the Captain of a vessel bound for Ireland, he succeeded in making his way down to the sea, and so passed over, not without extreme peril of drowning, to France, from whence he proceeded to Switzerland, and the higher parts of Germany.

In the course of these wanderings commenced his intimacy with Bullinger, whose writings had before interested him so deeply. Bullinger was at the same time himself an exile for the cause of religion, and gave Hooper a friendly reception at Zurich. At Basil, also, Hooper was courteously entertained by several learned men. During his residence at Zurich he married a foreign lady, a native of Burgundy\*.

His sojournment abroad was far from being a period of leisure and inactivity to him. He was diligent in his studies, and especially in learning the Hebrew language. Here then he continued in these labours, until a better day dawned upon England, in the accession of Edward VI. to the throne, in the year 1547. An opportunity was then afforded him of bestowing his services to the advancement of religion, and not being content to be wanting to the good work he immediately prepared for his return. Coming therefore to Bullinger, and others of his acquaintance at Zurich, he returned them thanks for their great kindness towards him, and imparted to them his intention of returning to England. Upon which Bullinger took leave of him in the following terms of affectionate regret:—"Master Hooper, although we are sorry to part with your company, for our own cause, yet much greater causes we have to rejoice, both for your sake, and especially for the cause of Christ's true religion, that you shall now return out of long banishment into your native country again; where not only you may enjoy your own private liberty, but also the cause and state of Christ's Church by you may fare the better, as we doubt not but it shall.—Another cause, moreover, why we rejoice with you and for you,

---

\* Another account says, a German. Note to Wordsworth's *Ecc. Biog.* Vol. ii. p. 463.

is this, that you shall remove not only out of exile into liberty, but you shall leave here a barren, and sour, and an unpleasant country, rude and savage, and shall go into a land flowing with milk and honey, replenished with all pleasure and fertility. Notwithstanding with this our rejoicing, one fear and care we have, lest you being absent, and so far distant from us, or else coming to such abundance of wealth and felicity, in your new welfare, and plenty of all things, and in your flourishing honours, where ye shall come, peradventure, to be a Bishop, and where ye shall find so many new friends, you will forget us, your old acquaintance and well-willers. Nevertheless, howsoever you shall forget and shake us off, yet this persuade yourself, that we will not forget our old friend and fellow, Master Hooper. And if you will please not to forget us again, then I pray you, let us hear from you."

To this parting address Hooper replied, "That he gave Bullinger and the rest most hearty thanks for their singular good-will and undeserved affection, appearing, not only on that occasion, but at all times, towards him—declaring, moreover, that, as the principal cause of his removing from thence to his country was the matter of religion, so with respect to the unpleasantness and barrenness of their country, these were no reasons to him that he should not find it in his heart to continue his life there, as soon as in any place in the world, and rather than in his own native country, if there were nothing else in his conscience that influenced him otherwise; and as to forgetting his old friends, although, said he, the remembrance of a man's country naturally doth delight him; neither could he deny but God had blessed his country of England with many great commodities, yet neither the nature of country, nor pleasure of commodities, nor newness of friends, should ever induce him to the oblivion of such friends and benefactors, whom he was so entirely bound unto; and therefore you shall be sure, said he, from time to time, to hear from me, and I will write unto you as it goeth with me. But the last news of all I shall not be able to write; for then, he added, taking Bullinger by the hand, when I shall take most pains, then shall you hear of me to be burned to ashes; and that shall be the last news which I shall not be able to write unto you, but you shall hear it of me."

Having thus taken his farewell of Bullinger and his friends at Zurich, he repaired to England. Arriving there, he became immediately an active coadjutor in the work of the Reformation. In London he preached regularly at least once every day, and often twice. In his sermons he applied himself to the correction of sin, sharply inveighing against the iniquity of the world and the corrupt abuses of the Church. As a preacher, in doctrine he was earnest—in language, eloquent—in knowledge of the Scriptures, perfect—in pains, indefatigable. The people flocked in such numbers to hear him, that often the Church was so full, that none could enter further than the doors.

After he had thus practised himself in this "popular and common kind of preaching," he was called to preach before the King. Poinet\* and himself were appointed to preach in turn, at the Court, on the

---

\* Afterwards Bishop of Rochester and Winchester successively.

Wednesdays and Fridays through Lent. He was also sent to preach in Kent and Essex.

His labours in the cause of the reformed religion were so appreciated, that he was judged worthy of elevation to the episcopal office, and through the interest of the Earl of Warwick, (afterwards the Duke of Northumberland) was nominated to the see of Gloucester, May 15, 1550.

But hereupon no little difficulty arose with regard to his acceptance of the bishopric. Having been so much an exile from his country, and a resident at Zurich at a time not very favourable to moderation in religious views and conduct—he had imbibed notions upon the matters of reformation too rigid and scrupulous. He had not enjoyed that excellent training, which others had, in the school of Cranmer. At Zurich, where, we find, his chief abode was whilst he was abroad, an extravagant degree of animosity against the Church of Rome had been excited by a current suspicion, that there was a latent design of re-establishing Popery, by keeping up an exterior conformed to that of the exploded superstition. A like alarm at the same time pervaded all Germany, in consequence of the Interim\*, which had been promulgated to the Protestants, after the death of Luther, by the Emperor Charles V.; and by which it was set forth, that existing forms were to remain, qualified, indeed, by some milder constructions than those which the Papists assign to them, but still with the same appearance which they had before, until a General Council should have decided on the points at issue. The dread of Popery being again introduced in all its abominations, under the mask of things indifferent, induced many of the foreign Reformers to look even at such things with a trembling apprehension, and to debate them accordingly with a vehemence and obstinacy which appear to the calm eye of reason, indeed, absurdly disproportionate to the objects under discussion—but which claim our indulgent consideration, when we reflect, what it is for the mind to have been recently roused to action from the torpor of a dominant superstition, and how things, little in themselves, are magnified by their proximity to a danger from which we have hardly escaped. Hooper, who was by his temperament of mind naturally inclined to severity, readily adopted those views of reformation which were prevalent at the place of his exile, and thus returned to England with an inveterate antipathy to the use of the ministerial vestments. Hence, on being nominated to the bishopric of Gloucester, he made a representation of his scruples to the King, and humbly requested that the King would either permit him to decline the honour which it was proposed to confer on him, or dispense with his conformity in the matter of the vestments.

To this request the King acceded, and wrote consequently to the Archbishop of Canterbury, permitting him to dispense with the accustomed ceremonies in the consecration of Hooper, whom he highly commends, as “a Professor of Divinity, chosen as well for his great knowledge, deep judgment, and long study both in the Scriptures and

\* The Interim, while it retained most of the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church of Rome, rejected the celibacy of the Clergy, and the Half-Communion.



other profane learning, as also for his good discretion, ready utterance, and honest life."

This letter of the King was accompanied by one from the Earl of Warwick to the Archbishop, in which it was requested, that the oath of supremacy might also be dispensed with at the consecration. For this was another scruple which arose in the mind of Hooper;—the form of the oath being in these words: "by God, by the Saints, and by the Holy Gospels"—to which expressions he objected as impious and against his conscience.

The difficulty respecting the oath was soon removed. For when Hooper, appearing before the Council, argued that God only ought to be appealed to in an oath, since he only knew the thoughts of men, the King, who was present, was so convinced, that with his own pen he struck the objectionable words out of the oath, saying, that no *creature* was to be appealed to in an oath. But the scruple of wearing the vestments\* was not so easily to be satisfied. The use of the vestments was now established by law, and the Archbishop therefore could not dispense with them in the consecration of Hooper, without incurring the risk of a *præmunire*. Nor did he think even the King's letter in itself sufficient to secure him against established laws: besides that, he considered the objection of Hooper as frivolous and improper to be conceded.

As the consent of the Archbishop could not be obtained, the next expedient was to persuade Hooper of the unreasonableness of his opinion, and thus to obtain his compliance with the prescribed ceremonial. All were anxious, in fact, that so valuable a servant in the cause of religion should not be lost to the Church, through any groundless scruples relative to unessential points. Ridley, accordingly, now Bishop of London, was appointed as the person best qualified, by his great learning, to confer with Hooper on the subject of the vestments. The matter was argued at great length between them, until indeed the contention was carried to some warmth—but still no impression could be made on Hooper, so as to induce him to recede at all from his opinion. Upon this, the Council sent for Hooper, and feeling averse to the continuance of a controversy between men united in a common profession, required him to desist from giving further occasion to such strife. He requested their permission to put in writing the arguments which had led to his view of the matter. This was granted, and his arguments, it seems, were submitted to Ridley, who was ordered to attend before the Council, at Richmond, in the October following, with such answers as he might have prepared to the statements of Hooper.

In the mean time, the Archbishop (according to his practice of consulting with learned foreigners) wrote to Martin Bucer, at Cambridge, for his judgment on the point in dispute. Hooper also wrote to Bucer, as well as to Peter Martyr, then Professor of Divinity at Oxford, to consult them on the question. His own grounds of objection were—that to use the vestments would be to call back again the priesthood of

---

\* Neal says that Hooper was "as much for the Clergy's wearing a decent and distinct habit from the Laity, as Ridley, but prayed to be excused from the odd symbolizing Popish garments,"—*Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. 1. p. 62.

Aaron, and that it had no authority in Scripture or primitive antiquity, but had been introduced into the Church in the most corrupt ages of Christianity, and being an invention of Antichrist, as such, was not indifferent. Bucer replied, that he considered the use of the vestments to be lawful, and that a person offended who affirmed that to be unclean, which God had sanctified, and the civil magistrate prescribed—adding, that as they had been in some instances an occasion of superstition, in others of contention, it were better at some good opportunity wholly to take them away. Peter Martyr replied nearly to the same effect; that, though he would prefer abolishing the use of the vestments as more according to the simplicity of primitive worship, yet they were not objectionable as contrary to the word of God, and therefore might be used until the times would bear the removal of them—that they did not originate with the Pope, as before the usurpations of the Papal Church there were differences of garments in the Church—or even if they had so originated, that this was no valid objection to them—that, if they were simple and plain, they would not engross the admiration of the people in themselves, as Hooper suspected—that to the clean all things were clean—and that it was not necessary to have express authority of Scripture for what we do in holy things. Peter Martyr also takes notice, in his reply to Hooper, of his “unseasonable and too bitter sermons”—from whence it is inferred, that Hooper also was in the habit of declaiming against the vestments from the pulpit.

But as the conference with Ridley had not succeeded in satisfying the scruples of Hooper, so neither did the considerations urged by Bucer and Martyr, win him to compliance. This continued obstinacy excited the displeasure of the Council, and gentle expedients having been hitherto tried ineffectually, it was endeavoured to subdue his refractoriness by rigorous measures. He was now commanded by the Council to keep his house, unless it were to repair to the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Bishops of Ely, London, or Lincoln, for counsel and satisfaction of his conscience; and neither to preach nor read until he had further license from the Council. But instead of obeying this command, he went out as before, and published also a book entitled, *A Confession of his Faith*, written in such a manner as to give still greater distaste to his proceedings. Nor did he abstain from indulging in public complaints against the King's Counsellors.

On January the 13th of the following year, the Court being then at Greenwich, he again appeared before the Council, (the Archbishop being present) when, for his disobedience to the former command of the Council, as well as for his continued resistance to the established ceremonial, he was committed to the Archbishop's custody, either to be reformed, or further punished, as his case might require.

The Archbishop then did his utmost endeavours to satisfy him \*. But he continued as immovable as ever. The Archbishop accordingly reported to the Council that he could bring him to no conformity, but that Hooper declared himself for a form of ordination different from

---

\* Burnet says, that Cranmer was inclined to concede the point, but that Ridley and Goodrick (Bishop of Ely) stood firm to the law.

that established by law. Upon this representation, it was determined by the Council, that Hooper should be committed to the Fleet.

To the Fleet then he was sent, with injunctions to the Warden of the prison to keep him from conference with all persons except the Ministers of the house; and here he continued until the month of March, when matters were in some sort compromised, as Burnet expresses it—Hooper consenting to be robed in the episcopal habits on particular occasions, such as his consecration, and on preaching before the King, or in his Cathedral, but being dispensed with at other times. Thus, when about ten months had elapsed from the time of his nomination to the bishopric, he was at last consecrated Bishop of Gloucester, March 8th, 1551.

The summer after his consecration, he went down to his diocese, and made a strict visitation of it—fortified with letters from the Council, in order to add to his authority, and consequently to his means of doing good, among an ignorant, stubborn, and superstitious people. First he sent a general monitory letter to his Clergy, signifying his intention of coming among them, and gravely advising them concerning the duties required of them in their holy office. When he came amongst them, he gave them articles of religion to the number of fifty, framed with a view to unity and agreement both in doctrine and ceremonies. Besides these articles, he gave them injunctions to the number of thirty-one, and twenty-seven interrogatories concerning their parishioners and their manner of life. There were also other articles which he gave for the examination of the Clergy, concerning the Ten Commandments, the Articles of Faith, and the petitions of the Lord's Prayer\*.

Being naturally an active man, he devoted all his energies of mind and body to the spiritual improvement of his diocese. He preached often twice, sometimes thrice, or even four times, a day, labouring both to instruct the people and reform the Clergy. Nor were his labours confined to the diocese of Gloucester alone. For the see of Worcester becoming vacant in October this year, by the deprivation of Heath, who had held it since the resignation of Latimer—and requiring a vigilant and industrious Superintendent, it was given to Hooper, to hold in commendam. In July the year following, he visited this diocese also, which he found greatly disordered. But before he had finished his visitation, he was anxious to return to Gloucester, hearing unsatisfactory accounts of the behaviour of some of the Clergy there. He had left them the last year apparently very compliant with the measures of reformation, and took their subscription to the articles of religion.

\* These questions sufficiently indicate the reigning ignorance of the Clergy. Some of them were—"How many commandments are there—Where are they written—Whether they can recite them by heart—Whether they can say the petitions of the Lord's Prayer by heart—How they know it to be the Lord's Prayer—Where it is written." "Which demands, (says Strype) how easy soever they were, many Curates and Priests (such was the ignorance of those days) could say but little to. Some could say the Pater Noster in Latin, but not in English; few could say the Ten Commandments; few could prove the Articles of Faith by Scripture: that was out of their way."—*Memorials of Crammer*, vol. i. p. 312. 8vo.

But in his absence they returned to their former corruptions. He still, however, conceived good hopes of the laity, if they had only good Magistrates and faithful Ministers placed among them, and wrote to that effect to Secretary Cecil, signifying also his desire that the Articles of Religion (then recently prepared by Cranmer) were set forth. These he intended to submit to the Clergy for their subscription in public before their parishioners, as he found that private subscriptions were no valid restraints to them. During this visit to Gloucester, he appointed certain of his Clergy Superintendents, who in his absence were to have a constant eye over the inferior Clergy.

After the correction of these abuses which had interrupted his progress through his new diocese, he returned to Worcester and proceeded in his visitation there. As was not unusual in those times, he found the most active opposition from the Prebendaries of the cathedral. Two of these, Johnson and Jolliff, disapproving some of the doctrines asserted in the articles which Hooper himself had proposed, held a dispute with him and Harley, who was afterwards Bishop of Hereford, on the points to which they objected. And one of them behaved most insolently and disrespectfully to him and to Harley.—Harley was afterwards charged with a report of the whole visitation and of this dispute in particular, to the Secretary; and the Council, taking cognizance of the dispute, it was referred to Cheke and Harley to report on it, that farther order might be taken respecting it. Hooper thus laments the occasion of it, in writing to the Secretary. “Ah Mr. Secretary, that there were good men in the Cathedral Churches, God then should have much more honour than he hath, the King’s Majesty more obedience, and the poor people better knowledge: but the realm wanteth light in such churches, whereas of right it ought most to be.”

At the same time he executed at Worcester the King’s Injunctions for the removal of superstition—but not without exciting great clamour against himself, as though he had spoiled the Church.

The visitation being finished, he still did not account his work complete; but again went over both his dioceses, to take account of his Clergy, how far they had profited since his last examination of them, and to oversee his Superintendents themselves, and distribute to them their share either of praise or censure. The pains and zeal which he bestowed, were not more feelingly than truly described, when, in his letters to the Secretary, he said: “There is none that eat their bread in the sweat of their face, but such as serve in public vocation. Yours is wonderful, but mine passeth.—Now I perceive that private labours be but plays, nor private troubles but ease and quietness.” So prodigal, indeed, was he of his exertions, that his wife, in concern for his safety, wrote to Bullinger, praying, that he would write to her husband, and persuade him to take a little more care of himself.

His great activity naturally awakened strong animosity on the part of those who were hostile to the Reformation; and hence we may account for the circumstance of great complaint being made of his behaviour in his diocese,—“of his insatiable covetousness, and his daily vexing his poor tenants, and Clergy without cause\*.” But in reality

\* Burnet has not given a just colouring to these scandals when he adds his own

he conducted himself so inoffensively, that his enemies had nothing substantial to urge against him. While he was seen in public going about from town to town, and from village to village, preaching the word of truth—and administering needful correction with the strictest impartiality—to the great and rich as well as to the poor—in the privacy of domestic life he was a pattern of the like diligent and faithful zeal. The time which he had to spare from preaching he bestowed, either in hearing public causes, or else in private study, prayer, and visiting schools. He governed his house so, that there was throughout it the savour of virtue—good example—honest conversation—and knowledge of the Scriptures. Such was his care in bringing up his own children in learning and good manners, that, as Fox well observes, it could not be discerned “whether he deserved more praise for his fatherly usage at home, or for his bishop-like doings abroad. For every where he kept one religion, in one uniform doctrine and integrity. So that if you entered into the Bishop’s palace, you would suppose to have entered into some church or temple.”

A striking instance of his impartiality is shewn in his reproof of Sir Anthony Kingston, a man of great consequence in that part of the country, who was accused of adultery. Immediately on the charge being laid before him, Hooper cited the offender into his court. Sir Anthony Kingston at first refused to appear, but at last came, and when Hooper severely reproved him for the crime, instead of submitting to the censure, retorted abusive language on the Bishop, and even proceeded to the indignity of striking him. He was, however, fined in five hundred pounds, and obliged to do penance for his crime. Nor was this correction lost upon him, for he became afterwards a penitent, and felt a friendship and gratitude to Hooper for his conduct towards him.

He was much given to hospitality. Though both his bishoprics united, did not produce him a very ample revenue, he bestowed the surplus of it above his wants, on the relief of the poor. At Worcester, the poor were entertained in his hall, in regular course, day after day, by four at a mess, with a wholesome meal—nor would he sit down to dinner himself until they were first served. At the same time he made a point of examining them, either himself, or by some one else in his stead, concerning the Lord’s Prayer, the Articles of the Faith, and the Ten Commandments.

Thus he continued in the laborious discharge of his pastoral office, until the death of King Edward, and the consequent accession of Mary put a period to his ministerial usefulness, and deprived the Church of one of her brightest lights.

At the deprivation of Bonner in the year 1549, Hooper had been a witness, together with Latimer, against him, of his seditious doctrines preached at Paul’s Cross. When Bonner’s party therefore was triumphant, he had to expect his full portion of malicious retribution. And indeed his extraordinary labours in the Reformation, rendered him a conspicuous mark to the bigoted counsellors with whom Mary was surrounded.

---

observation, that Hooper’s “firmness and sufferings afterwards raised his character more than his conduct in his diocese had done.”

Letters were accordingly dispatched, August 22d, 1553, requiring his immediate repair to the Court, to attend before the Lords of the Council—on two distinct causes. 1st, To answer to Dr. Heath, who had been deprived of the bishopric of Worcester in King Edward's days. 2ndly, To render an account to Dr. Bonner, Bishop of London, for the accusation brought against him which had led to his ejection.

The evil which was about to befall him, was not unforeseen by Hooper, for he had been expressly admonished by certain of his friends, to take measures for his safety by escape, but he would not take shelter from the impending storm. "Once did I flee," he said in answer to their warnings, "and took me to my feet, but now, because I am called to this place and vocation, I am thoroughly persuaded to tarry, and to live and die with my sheep."

Proceeding then to London in obedience to the summons, before he could reach Heath and Bonner, he was intercepted and commanded by force to appear before the Queen and her Council at Richmond, on the 29th of August, in answer to certain bonds and obligations, wherein he was said to be indebted to the Queen. As soon as he appeared before them, the Bishop of Winchester received him very opprobriously, and began to accuse him of his religion. In reply, he freely and boldly declared his sentiments, and defended himself. The result was, that he was committed to the Fleet-prison on the 1st of September—it being declared to him that the cause of his imprisonment was only for certain sums of money for which he was indebted to the Queen, and not for religion.

On the 19th of March of the following year, he was again cited before the Bishops of Winchester, London, Durham, Chichester, and Llandaff, acting as the Queen's Commissioners, and further questioned. The examination first turned on the subject of his marriage. When he acknowledged that he was married, "and would be so until death unmarried him,"—the Bishop of Durham observed, that this confession was matter enough for his deprivation. To this Hooper excepted, as contrary to law. An interruption here took place from the indecent outcries and laughter of the Commissioners and other persons present. Day, Bishop of Chichester, looking scornfully at him, using vehement language, called him hypocrite; Tonsal, Bishop of Durham, called him beast, which expression was repeated by several of the by-standers. Amidst this clamour they proceeded to argue to him the impropriety of the marriage of the Clergy—but the uproar was so great that Hooper could not be fairly heard in reply,—Judge Morgan, who was present, interposing much insulting calumny against Hooper's proceedings at Gloucester, saying, "that there never was such a tyrant as he was." After this, Tonsal asked Hooper whether he believed the Corporal Presence in the Sacrament. He answered plainly "that there was none such, neither did he believe any such thing." Tonsal was then about to read out of some book, but the noise was so great that he was obliged to give up the attempt. Gardiner next asked Hooper "what authority moved him not to believe the Corporal Presence?" He said, "the authority of God's word," and alleged this text—*Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things.* Gardiner urged "that this text served nothing to his purpose,—that Christ



might be in heaven and in the Sacrament also. Hooper would have proceeded to enlarge on the text, but those who stood about Gardiner so seconded his saying with their clamours, that Hooper was not permitted to say any thing more in reply. Upon this, they bade the notaries write "that he was married, and that he said he would not leave his wife;—and that he believed not the Corporal Presence in the Sacrament:—wherefore he was worthy to be deprived of his bishopric." And he was accordingly deprived of his bishopric, and again committed to the Fleet.

He had already been imprisoned nearly seven months, and in the course of that time had endured the greatest privations and sufferings. He paid on entering the prison five pounds, as fees for his liberty, to Babington, the Warden, who immediately on the receipt of the money, complained to Gardiner, and he was then put in close confinement in the Tower Chamber of the Fleet, where he experienced the worst usage. Through the kind offices of a female friend, he obtained liberty to come down to dinner and supper, though still not suffered to speak with any of his friends, but compelled immediately after those meals to return to his chamber. Even during these times of comparative relaxation, he received nothing but unkindness from the Warden and his wife, who took those opportunities of quarrelling with him, and complaining of him to their patron, the Bishop of Winchester.

These persons having reported him to Gardiner, on account of an altercation with him on the subject of the Mass; in consequence of this information, he was placed in the wards of the prison. Here he continued a long time, having nothing for his bed but a straw pallet, with a few feathers in it, and a rotten covering, in a loathsome chamber, on one side of which was the sink of the house, and on the other the town ditch, so that the offensive effluvia, with which he was assailed, infected him with disease. By means of some charitable persons however, he was supplied, after some time, with a more comfortable bed. Lying in this miserable state, secured closely with bars and chains, he would often in his distress call for help. But the unpitied Warden, though he knew him to be almost in a dying state, would suffer none of his men to come to his relief; only saying, "Let him alone, it were a good riddance of him." Notwithstanding all this cruel usage, he paid, as he says of himself, always "like a Baron" to the Warden, as well in fees, as for his board, which was twenty shillings a week, and besides for his servant, up to the time when he was deprived of his bishopric.

His deprivation was succeeded by a similar course of treatment. He still continued to pay for his accommodation in the prison "as the best gentleman in the house," though he was used "more vilely than the veriest slave that ever came to the Hall Commons." William Downton, his servant, was also imprisoned, and was searched for letters. But all they could find on his person, was a list of some compassionate friends whose alms had relieved his master in prison. This list the Warden delivered to Gardiner, to work the ruin of these persons.

But it was some consolation to him, in the midst of these afflictions, to receive a letter, full of affectionate sympathy and encouraging con-



solation, from Ridley, then also a prisoner for the Gospel, in reply to two letters which he had addressed to him. These two sincere disciples of Christ then felt that they were brothers indeed, notwithstanding their temporary alienation, and could not forbear pouring forth their hearts to each other in friendly correspondence. "Your wisdom and my simplicity," says Ridley, in the course of his letter, "I grant, hath a little jarred, each of us following the abundance of his own sense and judgment; now, I say, be you assured, that even with my whole heart, God is my witness, in the bowels of Christ, I love you in the truth and for the truth's sake, which abideth in us, and, as I am persuaded, shall, by the grace of God, abide in us for evermore"—words, which must have carried the balm of comfort into the very bosom of the poor sufferer.

When about ten months more had elapsed of this miserable confinement, he was again brought, in the custody of the Warden, before the Bishop of Winchester and other Commissioners, at the house of the Bishop, on the 22d of January, 1555. Gardiner then, in the name of himself and the rest, earnestly besought Hooper to return to the unity of the Catholic Church, and to acknowledge the Pope to be the Head of the Church, according to the determination of the Parliament—promising, "that as he himself, with others, had received the Pope's blessing, and the Queen's mercy, so mercy was ready to be shewn to him and others, if he would arise with them, and condescend to the Pope's Holiness." Hooper answered, "that for as much as the Pope taught doctrines altogether contrary to the doctrine of Christ, he was not worthy to be accounted as a member of Christ's Church, much less to be Head thereof: wherefore he would in no wise condescend to any such usurped jurisdiction, neither esteemed he the Church, whereof they call him Head, to be the Catholic Church of Christ: for the Church only heareth the voice of her spouse Christ, and flieth the strangers. Howbeit, said he, if in any point to me unknown, I have offended the Queen's majesty, I shall most humbly submit myself to her mercy, if mercy may be had with safety of conscience, and without the displeasure of God." To this it was replied, "that the Queen would shew no mercy to the Pope's enemies." Whereupon the Warden was commanded to take him back again to the Fleet.

He was then removed from his late cell to a chamber near the Warden's own apartment. In the mean time, his cell was searched by Dr. Martin and others, for writings and books, but none were found.

After an interval of six days, he was again brought before the same Commissioners, at the church of St. Mary Overies. Having first undergone the harassing of disputation, he was set aside for a time, until Rogers, who was also brought up to receive a similar condemnation, had been examined. The examinations being ended, the Sheriffs of London were commanded, about four o'clock, to carry them both to the Counter in Southwark, there to remain until nine on the following morning, to see whether they would relent and return to the Roman Catholic Church. Hooper then went first with one of the Sheriffs, and Rogers after him with the other. When they were out of the Church, in which the Commissioners had assembled, Hooper, looking back and waiting until Rogers came near him, said, "Come, Brother Rogers,

must we too take this matter first in hand, and begin to fry these faggots?" "Yea, Sir, (said Rogers) by God's grace." "Doubt not (said Hooper) but God will give strength."

As they went forwards, the press of the multitude was so great in the streets, that it was with great difficulty that they could pass, persons thronging around them in admiration of their great constancy and fortitude. The Sheriff expressing, on the way, his wonder to Hooper that he had not been more patient towards Gardiner, Hooper answered, "Master Sheriff, I was nothing at all impatient, although I was earnest in my Master's cause, and it standeth me so in hand, for it goeth upon life and death, not the life and death of this world only, but also of the world to come."

Arriving at the Counter, they were committed to the Keeper, and confined in separate apartments, with orders that they should not be suffered to speak to each other, nor that any one should have access to them.

On the following day, the 29th of January, the Sheriffs conducted them once more into the presence of the Commissioners, at the church of St. Mary: and when, after long and earnest discourse, it was found that Hooper would by no means condescend to them, the Commissioners condemned him to be degraded, and read to him his condemnation. He was condemned on three points:—first, for maintaining the lawfulness of the marriages of the Clergy, both secular and religious; secondly, for his doctrine respecting divorce; and thirdly, for denying the Corporal Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Rogers also being condemned in like manner, they were both delivered to the secular power, to be conveyed first by the Sheriffs to the Clink, a prison not far from the Bishop of Winchester's house, where they were to remain until night.

When it was dark, Hooper was led by one of the Sheriffs, with many bills and weapons, first through the Bishop of Winchester's house, then over London Bridge, through the City to Newgate. From the fear of some attempt at a rescue of their prisoner on the part of the people, some of the Sergeants were sent forward to put out the candles of the costermongers, who used to sit with lights in the streets. But in spite of this precaution, the people having some notice of his passing that way, came out of their houses with lights and saluted him, praising God for his constancy in the true doctrine which he had taught them, and praying that he might be strengthened in the same to the end. As he passed on, he besought them to make their earnest prayers to God for him, and going through Cheapside, at length reached Newgate.

In Newgate he continued closely confined for six days; during which time, no one was allowed to come to him or talk with him except the Keepers, and such as might be appointed to visit him. Among such visitors were Bonner, Feckenham, Chedsey, and Harpsfield, who exerted their utmost endeavours to seduce him from his better persuasion. Disputations were not the only means which they employed for this purpose. On the one hand, they shewed all gentleness, making proffers of friendship and worldly advantages—on the other, they tried to intimidate him with grievous threats. But they found him always one man, stedfast and immovable. Perceiving that they could

not prevail with him in the least, they resorted to the mean and disgraceful expedient of falsely asserting a triumph over him, where he had not the opportunity of confronting the scandal. They spread rumours of his recantation among the people, which were the more readily credited from the very circumstance that Bonner and the others were known often to resort to him. These rumours at last reached Hooper himself, and gave him much pain. To clear himself of the imputation, he wrote a letter, dated the 2d of February, to his fellow-prisoners for the Gospel, in which he explains the reason of that courtesy which he had used towards Bonner and his Chaplains, in admitting them to conference with him, (which was, that he might avoid the suspicion of being either proud or unlearned,) and requests that they would not believe any such rumour of him, after the pains and imprisonment which he had already undergone—concluding with these words: “I have taught the truth with my tongue, and with my pen heretofore, and hereafter shortly will confirm the same by God’s grace with my blood.”

On Monday morning the 4th of February, Bonner came to Newgate, and there degraded Hooper from the order of priesthood, regarding him as no more than a Priest, on account of his consecration to the order of a Bishop having taken place during a period of separation from the Papal Church\*. Rogers was degraded at the same time with him, and being first delivered over to the Sheriffs, was led out alone to the place of execution in Smithfield, where he suffered,—being the first victim of the Marian persecution.

On the same day, at night, Hooper learned from his Keeper, that it was intended to send him to Gloucester, to suffer death there. He felt much joy at this circumstance, lifting up his eyes and hands to heaven, and praising God, “that He saw it good, to send him amongst the people, over whom he was Pastor, there to confirm with his death the truth, which he had before taught them:—not doubting but that God would give him strength to perform the same to his glory.” Immediately he sent to his servant’s house for his boots, spurs, and cloak, that he might be in readiness to ride when he should be called.

About four o’clock in the morning of the following day, the Keeper, with others, came to him, and searched his person and his bed for any manuscript that he might have written, and then he was led forth by the Sheriffs and their Officers out of Newgate, to a place near St. Dunstan’s church, in Fleet-street, where six of the Queen’s Guard were appointed to receive him, and to carry him to Gloucester, to be executed there. The Guard first conducted him to the Angel, where he breakfasted more heartily than he had done for some time past. About break of day, he set out on the journey with the Guard, springing cheerfully on horseback without help, having a hood on his head under his hat, that he might not be recognized by the way. For the same reason, also, they carried him to those Inns, where by inquiry of him they found he was not accustomed to lodge.

They reached Cirencester on the Thursday following, about eleven,

---

\* The same conduct was adopted at last towards Ridley. See No. for January, p. 15. The ceremonies observed in degrading Hooper and Rogers, were the same as in the case of Ridley.

and there dined at the house of a woman, who had been an enemy both to the truth, and to the person of Hooper. This woman, perceiving the melancholy errand on which he was proceeding, relented in her spirit, and was now anxious to shew all friendship towards him—lamenting his case with tears, and confessing, that before she had often asserted, that if he were put to the trial, he would not stand to his doctrine.

After dinner he resumed his journey, and reached Gloucester about five o'clock. At a mile without the town, there was a great concourse of people assembled, who shewed a deep sympathy in his misfortunes by their cries and lamentations—insomuch that one of the Guard rode forward into the town to obtain aid from the authorities there, in case it might be required to secure their prisoner. The Officers and their retinue came to the gate with arms, and commanded the people to keep their houses. There was, however, no attempt at violence. That night he lodged at the house of one Ingram, and took the refreshment of a meal with composure, as he had done on his journey, and slept his first sleep soundly. After his first sleep, he continued the remainder of the night in prayer until morning—and then desired that he might go into the next chamber (for the Guard were also in that in which he slept), that there, being in solitude, he might pray and talk with God. Thus, with the exception of a short time spent at his meal, or in conversation with such as were permitted to speak with him, he was incessantly occupied in prayer.

Among those who visited him here was Sir Anthony Kingston—who had been appointed by the Queen, one of the Commissioners, to see execution done upon him. Kingston found him at his prayers, and as soon as he saw him, burst into tears. Hooper not immediately recognizing him,—“Why, my Lord,” said Kingston, “do you not know me, an old friend of yours, Anthony Kingston?” “Yes, Master Kingston,” replied Hooper, recollecting himself, “I do know you well, and am glad to see you in health, and do praise God for the same.” “But I am sorry,” resumed Kingston, “to see you in this case: for, as I understand, you be come hither to die. But alas! consider that life is sweet, and death is bitter. Therefore, seeing life may be had, desire to live; for life hereafter may do good.” Noble indeed was the answer returned to this suggestion, by this intrepid champion of the truth.—“Indeed it is true,” he said, “Master Kingston, I am come hither to end this life and to suffer death here, because I will not gainsay the former truth, that I have heretofore taught amongst you in this diocese, and elsewhere: and I thank you for your friendly counsel, although it be not so friendly as I could have wished it. True it is, Master Kingston, that death is bitter and life is sweet: but alas! consider that the death to come is more bitter, and the life to come is more sweet. Therefore, for the desire and love I have to the one, and the terror and fear of the other, I do not so much regard this death, nor esteem this life, but have settled myself, through the strength of God’s Holy Spirit, patiently to pass through the torments and extremities of the fire now prepared for me, rather than to deny the truth of this word, desiring you and others in the mean time, to commend me to God’s mercy in your prayers.”—Kingston finding him thus resolute, proceeded to take leave of him in terms of affection, expressing his gratitude to him

as the person by whose instrumentality God had reclaimed him when he was a lost child, and brought him to forsake his crimes. "If you have had grace so to do," continued Hooper, "I do highly praise God for it, and if you have not, I pray God you may have, and that you may continually live in his fear." More words passed between them, as they thus took leave of each other—Kingston weeping bitterly, and the tears also trickling down Hooper's cheeks. As Kingston departed, Hooper told him that all the troubles he had sustained in prison had not caused him to utter so much sorrow.

The same day, in the afternoon, a blind boy, whose name was Thomas Drowry, after long solicitation of the Guard, obtained admission to his presence. Hooper, after examining him as to his faith, and hearing that he had been imprisoned at Gloucester for confessing the truth, beheld him stedfastly, and (the tears appearing in his eyes) said to him: "Ah poor boy! God hath taken from thee thy outward sight, for what consideration he best knoweth—but he hath given thee another sight much more precious—for he hath endued thy soul with the eye of knowledge and faith. God give thee grace continually to pray unto him, that thou lose not that sight, for then shouldest thou be blind both in body and soul."

This poor blind boy, in a little more than a year after, fulfilled the pious benediction of Hooper—by dying in the flames at Gloucester, a martyr to the truth.

To another visitor, a Papist, who came affecting to condole with him, Hooper replied with some sternness: "Be sorry for thyself, man, and lament thine own wickedness—for I am well, I thank God, and death to me, for Christ's sake, is welcome."

On the night of that day he was committed by the Guard, their commission having expired, to the custody of the Sheriffs of Gloucester. These, with the Mayor and Aldermen, repaired to his lodgings, and, at the first meeting, saluted him and took him by the hand. He addressed himself to them, saying, "Master Mayor, I give most hearty thanks to you, and to the rest of your brethren, that you have vouchsafed to take me, a prisoner, and a condemned man, by the hand; whereby, to my rejoicing, it is some deal apparent, that your old love and friendship towards me is not altogether extinguished; and I trust also, that all the things I have taught you in times past are not utterly forgotten, when I was here, by the godly King that dead is, appointed to be your Bishop and Pastor. For the which most true and sincere doctrine, because I will not now account it falsehood and heresy, as many other men do, I am sent hither (as I am sure you know) by the Queen's commandment, to die; and am come, where I taught it, to confirm it with my blood. And now, Master Sheriffs, I understand by these good men, and my very friends, (meaning the Guard) at whose hands I have found so much favour and gentleness by the way hitherward, as a prisoner could reasonably require, (for the which also I most heartily thank them) that I am committed to your custody, as unto them that must see me brought to-morrow to the place of execution. My request therefore, to you, shall be only, that there be a quick fire, shortly to make an end, and in the mean time, I will be as obedient unto you, as yourselves could wish. If you think I do amiss in any thing, hold up your

finger, and I have done. For I am not come hither as one inforced, or compelled to die, for it is well known, I might have had my life with worldly gain; but as one willing to offer and give my life for the truth, rather than to consent to the wicked papistical religion of the Bishop of Rome, received and set forth by the Magistrates in England, to God's high displeasure and dishonour; and I trust, by God's grace, to-morrow to die a faithful servant of God, and a true obedient subject of the Queen."

By this address many of the Officers present were much moved. Still it would have been determined by the Sheriffs that he should have been lodged that night in the common gaol of the town, had not the Guard interposed to prevent it, representing his gentle and patient behaviour on his journey, and that they would themselves rather watch with him than that he should be sent to the common gaol. At length then it was resolved to permit him to remain the night at Ingram's house, the sheriffs, and other officers, themselves keeping watch. Alleging that he had many things to remember, he went to his rest as early as five in the afternoon—and having slept a sound sleep, he bestowed the remainder of the night in prayer. After rising in the morning, he desired that no man should be suffered to come into his chamber, that he might be alone until the hour of execution.

About eight in the morning, (it being Saturday, the 9th of February, 1555,) came the Lord Chandos, Sir John Bridges, Sir Anthony Kingston, Sir Edmund Bridges, and others, appointed as Commissioners for the execution; and at nine, Hooper was desired to be in readiness, as the time was at hand. Immediately he was brought from his chamber by the Sheriffs, who were accompanied with armed men. Seeing the armed force, he exclaimed, "Master Sheriffs, I am no traitor\*, neither needed you to have made such a business to bring me to the place where I must suffer: for if ye had willed me, I would have gone alone to the stake, and have troubled none of you all." Observing the great assemblage of people, for it was supposed that there were seven thousand collected, (as it was not only market day, but many also came expressly as witnesses of his behaviour in death) he said: "Alas! why be these people assembled and come together, peradventure they think to hear something of me now, as they have in times past; but alas! speech is prohibited to me. Notwithstanding, the cause of my death is well known unto them. When I was appointed here to be their Pastor, I preached unto them true and sincere doctrine, and that out of the word of God. Because I will not now account the same to be heresy and untruth, this kind of death is prepared for me."

Thus he advanced to the stake, between the Sheriffs, in a gown borrowed from his host, with his hat on his head and a staff in his hand—for he was lame from the pain of the sciatica, which he had taken in prison. As he went on he said not a word, but beholding the people

\* There had been a scandalous charge against him of his having written a letter to certain persons in prison, encouraging them to curse the Queen, whereas, on the contrary, he had always shewn great loyalty towards her; having sent horses to her when in trouble, both out of Worcestershire and Gloucestershire.



sorrowing around him, he sometimes lifted up his eyes towards heaven, and looked so cheerfully on such as he knew, that they thought his countenance never seemed more composed and lively than at that moment. Having reached the place of execution, which was near to a great elm tree which stood over against the College of Priests, where he was wont to preach, he smilingly viewed the stake and the preparations. The place round about the houses, and the boughs of the trees, were filled with people, and in the chamber over the college-gate stood the Priests of the college. He then kneeled down to prayer, beckoning to Sir Edmund Bridges, whom he knew well, to listen to his prayer, that he might report it afterwards—who attentively obeyed his request. In this prayer, which turned upon the whole creed, he continued half an hour, weeping profusely in the intensity of his devotion. After he had commented it, a box, asserted to contain his pardon, was brought and laid before him, to tempt him to recant—at the sight of which he cried; “If you love my soul, away with it—if you love my soul, away with it.”—The box being taken away, the Lord Chandos said: “Seeing there is no remedy, dispatch quickly.” Hooper only begged that he might have leave to end his prayers.

The Lord Chandos then spoke to Sir Edmund Bridges (who was his son), saying, “Edmund, take heed that he do nothing else but pray: if he do, tell me, and I shall quickly dispatch him.” Whilst these words passed, some persons drew near and heard the following portion of the prayer:

“Lord, thou art a gracious God and merciful Redeemer. Have mercy therefore upon me, most miserable and wretched offender, after thy great mercy, and according to thine inestimable goodness. Thou art ascended into heaven; receive me to be partaker of thy joys, where thou sittest in equal glory with thy Father. For well knowest thou, Lord, wherefore I am come hither to suffer, and why the wicked do persecute this thy poor servant: not for my sins and transgressions committed against thee, but because I will not allow their wicked doings, to the contaminating of thy blood, and to the denial of the knowledge of thy truth, wherewith it did please thee by thy Holy Spirit to instruct me: the which, with as much diligence as a poor wretch might, (being thereto called) I have set forth to thy glory; and well seest thou, my Lord and my God, what terrible pains and cruel torments be prepared for thy creature: such, Lord, as without thy strength none is able to bear, or patiently to pass. But all things that are impossible with man, are possible with thee. Therefore strengthen me of thy goodness, that in the fire I break not the rules of patience, or else assuage the terror of the pains, as shall seem most to thy glory.”

This was all that could be heard of the prayer, for the Mayor discovering those who had approached to listen to it, ordered them to retire. After the prayer, Hooper immediately prepared himself for the stake. Taking off the gown first, he delivered it to the Sheriffs, with strict charge to restore it to the owner—and so proceeded to take off the rest of his clothes, except his doublet and hose, in which he wished to have burned; but the Sheriffs would not permit it. He was then stripped to his shirt, in which he had the presence of mind himself to fasten, with a point of his hose, a pound of gunpowder in a



bladder between his legs, and the same quantity under each arm. This he obtained through the kindness of the Guard. Then desiring the people to say the Lord's Prayer with him, and to pray for him, he went up to the stake—to which they were proceeding to secure him with three irons—one for his neck, another for his middle, and a third for his legs—when he observed to them, "Ye have no need thus to trouble yourselves: for I doubt not but God will give strength sufficient to abide the extremity of the fire without bands. Notwithstanding, suspecting the frailty and weakness of the flesh, but having assured confidence in God's strength, I am content ye do as ye shall think good." They then secured him with the iron hoop round the middle; they would still have fastened the other irons round his neck and legs, but he prevailed with them to omit these—adding further, "I am well assured I shall not trouble you."

The preparations being completed, he stood elevated on a stool above the spectators—a situation which, added to his tall figure, enabled him to take a survey of the assembled multitude, amongst whom there was nothing to be seen but weeping and sorrow. Then lifting up his eyes and hands to heaven, he prayed in secret. The executioner came up to him to ask his forgiveness. Learning on what account his forgiveness was sought, he said, "Thou doest nothing to offend me:—God forgive thee thy sins, and do thine office, I pray thee." Then the reeds were heaped up, and he received two bundles of them in his own hands, embraced, and kissed them, and having disposed them under his arms, with an undisturbed fortitude pointed out how the rest should be placed, and where they were most needed.

The pile was then ordered to be kindled, but it was some time before it took fire, there being a quantity of green faggots which retarded the flame, so that it did not quickly communicate to the reeds. The morning also was lowering and cold with wind, which blew the flame from him, so that at first the fire only burned about him, and scarcely touched his person. Some dry faggots were then brought and the pile was rekindled—but still the fire was kept under on account of the direction of the wind, and only tortured him by scorching his skin, and burning his hair. During all this he repeated mildly, as if he felt no pain, "O Jesus, the Son of David, have mercy upon me, and receive my soul."—The second fire failing, he wiped his eyes with his hands, and called out: "For God's love, good people, let me have more fire." His lower extremities, however, were all the time under the action of the fire, which continued to burn below though it did not flame upwards. A third fire was kindled a little while after, which succeeded better, for then the bladders of gunpowder burst, but they had little effect in shortening his sufferings. The torments which he now endured are too dreadful to be adequately told. So long as he had power of speech he cried aloud, "Lord Jesu have mercy upon me—Lord Jesu have mercy upon me—Lord Jesus receive my spirit:—which were the last words he was heard to utter. Soon he became black in the mouth, and his tongue was swoln that he could not speak, yet his lips moved until they were shrunk to the gums. He beat his breast with his hands until one of his arms dropped off, and then con-

tinued the motion with the other, whilst the blood started from his fingers' ends, until that also, from the fire being renewed, became motionless, cleaving fast to the iron upon his breast. Then bowing forwards, his bowels having gushed out, he yielded up his spirit; having endured the agony of the flames for three quarters of an hour, or more, yet without any signs of impatience, dying "as quietly as a child in his bed \*."

Thus was that foreboding, which dwelled on the mind of this truly brave Martyr when he took leave of his friends at Zurich, accomplished in this scene of exemplary suffering: thus was a life of extraordinary exertion and travail, to him, not a passport to rest in old age, but only the prelude to a death of no common agony.

The protracted miseries which he had undergone in the long imprisonment which preceded his execution, had prematurely broken the healthy vigour of his body, (for he was not more than sixty years of age when he was cut off,) but his mind in the mean time had strengthened under the pressure which had been laid on it. In the afflicted sufferer for the Gospel's sake, we see nothing of that too impetuous zeal, which had before led him to resist the authorities both of the Church and the State, in so trivial a point as that of the ministerial vestments. The spirit, which was then bowed down in entire submission to the cross of Christ, no longer glowed with an ardour unworthy of the holy cause to which it was unreservedly devoted. The reconciliation which took place between Ridley and himself, while both of them were imprisoned in the common cause of the Gospel, marks the improved temper of Hooper, who first invited it by letters of kindness, as well as the frank generosity of Ridley, who as cordially received him into his affection.

Let it not, however, be understood, as if it were meant to pass too severe a censure on Hooper for his conduct in that matter. Intemperate and injudicious as his behaviour was, his motives were purely conscientious—while he refused to conform to the established ceremonial, he begged also that he might be allowed to decline the proffered bishopric. And if the Church has cause to blame him for originating a controversy, which proved afterwards a fruitful source of division among her members, let her place as an offset to this disparaging circumstance, the triumphant evidence which he gave to the purity of the reformed doctrine, in the display of its sustaining and consolatory efficacy under the sorest temptations of worldly adversity. Let the indiscretion by which he did her hurt, be buried in oblivion in the sincerity of that love with which he loved her, and in the excess of the good which he conferred on her by the abundant usefulness of his holy life and death. And let the error of this faithful servant be a warning to all, that, however conscientious their zeal may be, it is not sufficient, alone, to warrant their conduct in matters of religious exertion; but that, on the contrary, the more assured they are of the sincerity of their opinions, the more cautiously should they examine themselves, lest they be betrayed into an extravagant mode of defending and asserting them, to the detriment of the Church.

---

\* Fox,—whose simple and admirable account of this blessed martyr's last sufferings has been implicitly followed.

## REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Observations on the System of Wesleyan Methodism, in a Letter to the Rev. R. Johnson, Superintendent of the Hull Circuit. By Mark Robinson.*

"*Fas est et abhoste doceri;*"—but indeed Mr. Mark Robinson scarcely deserves to be called an enemy; he is a true Wesleyan—a primitive Methodist by principle, though in connection with the Conference Methodists:—the nature of this distinction being not well understood in general out of their own body, a concise explanation of the parties into which they are divided, may be not unacceptable. John Wesley, their founder, having divided the whole country into districts, appointed a travelling preacher for each. The annual assembling of these preachers, to render an account of their charge, and especially of the contributions levied in their respective circuits, forms the Conference: no arrangement could be more natural, or better calculated to serve his purpose, while the Society was yet in its infancy, and its organization not complete. But if Wesley could have foreseen the vast augmentation of wealth and numbers which it has since acquired, he would probably have founded his institution on a broader basis; for now the local preachers, and the leaders of class meetings, consider themselves of no mean importance, and consequently grow more and more impatient of their exclusion from Conference; it is in truth, as one of their own writers confesses, the most singular Aristocracy that ever yet existed: a permanent body of travelling preachers, not in any way chosen by the Society, govern it with absolute and despotic sway. "The Conference," says our author, "retains to itself the whole and sole power of making any law it pleases;" (P. 16.) the only apparent exception to this sweeping prerogative, is a permission given to the quarterly circuit meetings to object to any law which they think injurious to the district.—*Vox et præterea nihil*—for the operation of the law cannot be suspended, unless the preachers, who have already concurred in making it, concur also in the objection; and even then, if the next Conference persist in it, there is no remedy. And as arbitrary governments are not contented with the enjoyment of despotic power, but they must secure themselves against all risks by suppressing freedom of discussion, so Conference muzzles all its loving subjects, and forbids the expression of their opinions. "The chairman of the quarterly meeting can prevent any subject being discussed of which he *thinks* Conference will disapprove," (P. 11.) so that every circuit preacher,

presiding at these meetings, is in fact a Dictator, who clothing his own opinions with the majesty of Conference, proscribes at his discretion the subjects of debate: but the prerogative of Conference ends not here; it stretches far beyond the Quarterly meetings themselves; for if they should reject (it should rather be, object to) any new rule, they are prohibited from making it matter of discussion by *publications*, public meetings, or *otherwise*." (P. 12.) It is hard to say what number of radicals have at any time belonged to the Wesleyan Methodists; but it may fairly be assumed that they had their full share in proportion to their members; and there cannot well be a better proof, that the reforming mania was only an unnatural excitement, produced by some mischievous demagogues, than this fact, that, while the radicals in the Methodist Connexion were raving like madmen against political authority, which is so much controlled by popular opinion and other checks, they suffered themselves to be ridden by Conference with a hook in their nose, and a bridle in their mouth, and bore without murmuring a tyranny which levied heavy exactions upon their purses, shackled their opinions, and left them not the shadow of a right to interfere in their own concerns. "The people," says Dr. Coke, "have no power—we (i. e. the Conference) the *whole*, in the fullest sense which can be conceived." Long before the period we now speak of, this objection was felt so strongly, that in 1797 a large party separated from the Society, and formed what is called the New Connexion.

In process of time other exceptions were taken to the established discipline: in 1811 the Ranters, as they are commonly called, became a separate community; they maintained, that they best followed the example of their founders, by emancipating themselves from the restraints of buildings and circuits, and preaching wherever they found it expedient, or to use their own language, wherever they had a call, in the open air; and therefore they assumed the title of Primitive Methodists. They also have a representative Conference. Since that time many local preachers, ejected from the Connexion for non-conformity, have established congregational societies, who style themselves Independent Methodists; to this class probably may be referred a considerable party, who in the year 1820 began to be distinguished by the name of Tent Methodists, because they preached in tents, which was deemed by their brethren subversive of all established rules, and contrary to the allegiance which they owed to Conference. All these denominations of Methodists are dissenters from the Established Church; but there is a considerable body of them in Ireland, who call themselves Church Methodists, because they are in communion with the Establishment, or, Primitive Wesleyans, because Wesley, to the

latest hour of his life, strenuously opposed separation from the Church; he wished them to be auxiliaries, and not antagonists; he wished that their bond of union should be catholic, and not sectarian; that their zeal should be shown in promoting the interests of religion, and not the interests of a party;—in compliance, therefore, with his earnest and repeated exhortations upon this subject, they do not renounce communion with the Establishment: they do not administer the sacraments in their meetings, and they do not suffer their hours of worship to interfere with the service of the Church! In England these principles are not publicly professed by any society of Methodists, but they are adopted by a great many individuals in the Connexion, and among the rest by Mark Robinson, the author of this pamphlet; he was a class leader and local preacher for fourteen years, and is therefore a very competent witness as to the state of the Society. Though friendly to the Church, he is a staunch Methodist, and therefore his statements are not likely to be overcharged: he is a straight forward writer, who wishes to reform the abuses of their system by a plain exposition of facts, and therefore his statements are likely to be accurate.

“The Connexion,” says he, “is rapidly growing both in numbers and respectability.” (Intro. p. v.) Now if they recruited their host out of the camp of the common enemy, if their numbers were increased only by deserters from the cause of infidelity, where is the Christian who would not say—“Ride on because of the word of truth—we wish you good luck in the name of the Lord?” But there can be little doubt that many of those whose minds are prepossessed by Calvinistic doctrines, slide through the connecting medium of Wesleyan Methodism into direct hostility to the Established Church; and it is observable, that although the adults in close connexion with the Society amount *only* to a quarter of a million, yet these “are but a small part of the body of the people who regularly attend in the Methodist Chapels.” (Intro. p. xxxvi.) It may be useful therefore to shew the feelings and views of those who govern the mighty mass, to exhibit them in their proper colours, and to demonstrate upon data of unquestionable authority, that they are bigoted, selfish, and ambitious.

Of their bigotry we have a striking specimen in their treatment of the Tent Methodists, who relate the circumstances of their separation thus:—

“Among all the different classes of *professors or profane*, none but the Methodists attempted to arrest our progress; among them many were found who spoke against us privately, and preached against us

publicly ; numbers of them shunned us as they would the pestilence ; several made it their business to dissuade people from attending our ministry, and especially from joining us in religious communion, and when many of their members wished to join with us in our devotions, they passed a law prohibiting every Methodist from assisting us either by preaching, exhortation, or prayer, upon pain of expulsion from their Society." P. 68.

*Professors and profane*—for the information of those who are not acquainted with the new fangled jargon lately introduced into religion, it may be necessary to state, that the *professors of vital godliness* distinguish themselves by that title from the *profane* multitude, who have not undergone their own sensible regeneration. The doctrine of Election pushed too far is always the parent of intolerance : but what is principally remarkable in the extract given above, is the popishness of the excommunication which they attempted to enforce. The animosity engendered by so small a difference of opinion—a difference, by which no doctrine was impeached, no practice recommended by Scripture was affected—marks a spirit congenial with the Inquisition, and that would have loved an *auto da fè*.

"Where only opportunity doth want, not will,  
Potential 'persecution' stands for actual."

"Formodes of faith let zealots fight," and if these modes be momentous, we will defend them from the censure of the poet ; but that zeal must surely be graceless and bigoted, which fights bitterly and uncharitably for a regulation imposed by Conference or Wesley. If any one thinks this matter may have been misrepresented by a party who felt themselves aggrieved, let us turn to Mark Robinson's open avowal of the truth.

"Some of narrow and contracted minds among us, imagine that our system itself is as sacred as even the first principles of our religion, and that, therefore, to refuse our assent to the one, is as great an evil as to disbelieve the other ; that to take a part in diffusing even the same religious truths, under a different form of Church government, as, for instance, under a system allowing representatives of the people in Conference, would imply that such persons had *lost their piety*." P. 38.

Again : "a certain preacher in the Old Connexion has taken upon himself to aver publicly in different pulpits, that *all* who have left them as a body of people, have *died under a cloud*;" (p. 40.) which, according to the explanation of Mr. Watson, one of their travelling preachers, is "damnation poetically expressed." It is true that Watson condemns such rancorous effusions of party zeal ; but then his liberality can be accounted for : he had himself been a seceder from the Connexion. Nei-



ther is it a solitary instance ; others have used the same, or stronger language.

" A travelling preacher finding that a female member had neglected attendance on the class, observed : Some people will say, that if we turn them out of the Methodist Society, we cannot turn them out of heaven. He then, in a very solemn manner, added : I don't know that ; there is more meaning in that text of Scripture than many people think of—' Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' "—P. 41.

This claim of power might have been ranked among the proofs of their ambition ; but it will be observed, that the occasion which produced it, was the neglect of an ordinance invented by themselves. Like the Pharisees, they " lay heavy burthens upon men's shoulders," and if the least point of ceremonial observance be infringed, they denounce the vengeance of heaven, or, which is the same thing, of Conference.

2. The principles by which the Society is governed, are selfish, mercenary, and worldly. To prove the truth of this charge, it might be sufficient to adduce evidence, that while they fret and fume at the least breach of discipline, they " eulogize those for their attachment to Methodism, who are publicly arguing on principles, which the Conference acknowledge to be dangerous to Christianity itself." (P. 8. Introduction.) For if the leaders of a religious sect be plainly not animated by a zeal for religion in the conduct of their affairs, baser motives must of necessity be inferred. But the Methodist preacher shall decide the point himself : his testimony, that it is a secular and worldly spirit which actuates them, is most decisive.

" The tent preachers," he says, " were acknowledged to be men of piety and talent ; their doctrines were approved of ; many hundreds of persons had been converted by their preaching ; but they were concerned in building places of worship, which they did not make over for the use of the *Preachers* : and for this, according to the superintendent's own account, Mr. Pocock was ejected. Now, let the impartial contrast this with the fact, that it is acknowledged by the Conference, that some of the preachers hold and publish religious doctrines dangerous to the welfare of people's souls ; and yet they are retained and publicly praised for their attachment to Methodism." P. 68.

" Begging," said Mr. Bramwell, one of their most eminent men, " is too much the business of the year. How can I raise the monies ? appear fair at Conference ? &c. are considerations, which, it is to be feared, affect some of us more deeply than the salvation of souls. A preacher has been known to labour two years in a circuit, without ever being questioned concerning the spiritual state of the people. The enquiry has uniformly been, Did you make the collections ? Have you got the money ? " P. 25.



But not only are they thus convicted of worshipping Mammon, their worldliness is besides altogether selfish, and their views extend not beyond their own advantage. "When the local preachers in two of the principal circuits met, for the purpose of establishing a local preacher's fund, the superintendents threatened to silence them as local preachers, if they persisted." (P. 24.) The local preachers receive nothing for their labour. What then becomes of the preacher's fund? It goes entirely to the travelling preachers, who receive salaries averaging 200*l.* per annum, and sometimes more. Truly these are *spolia opime*—these are great inducements to act upon the principle satirized by Horace—*Conficias rem, si possis, recte; si non, quocunque modo rem.* Their emoluments, according to this statement, exceed the average income of livings in the Established Church. But this is not all; there is another fund, into which hundreds and thousands have been poured, year after year, besides the annual subscriptions of the preachers, the appropriation of which is buried in most mysterious concealment. The Conference are afraid to publish any account of it to the world, "lest the magnitude of the amount should deter their adherents from subscribing." (p. 22.) *O fortunati nimium sua si bona norint.* That the Conference preachers themselves, however, know how to appreciate their advantages is obvious; for

"Some have supposed, that there is ground for apprehension, that the Methodist ministry may become hereditary, and that the sons of the preachers may issue from the two public schools, and fill the vacancies as they occur, to the almost entire exclusion of those who would, on the whole, be more acceptable to the people." P. 35.

With the whole power and the whole emoluments of the Society they cannot be content, unless they perpetuate the sovereignty in their families, by legitimate descent and hereditary succession. Why does not the spirit of Wesley rise before the aspiring conclave, and admonish them like Wolsey, "I charge you fling away ambition—by that sin the angels fell!" and therefore, doubtless, angels *elect* may do the same. No, no: there would be an immediate cry of heresy and schism; for grace is indefectible and Conference infallible: and so the venerable Founder's ghost would soon be rejected from the connexion.

3. Ambitious, however, they are, and their ambition cannot be altogether a matter of indifference to the Established Church, if the assertion of one of their travelling preachers has any truth in it: "We Methodists can do any thing." (p. 20.) We have already seen one of them laying claim to St. Peter's keys, and the power of excluding from heaven; it is not, therefore, any matter of wonder, that they aspire to the dignity, as well as to the

authority, of Apostles. "An attempt has been made to introduce episcopal ordination into the Conference." (p. 33.) "Several leading preachers assembled at Lichfield, to contrive how certain of them could be made Bishops." (p. 14.) This is a strong measure for a sect who have recorded a resolution in their Minutes, that their Preachers should not be called Ministers, nor assume the title of Reverend, and is properly regarded by the writer of this letter to the *Reverend R. Johnson*, Superintendent of the Hull circuit, as an evident attempt to establish a rival Church. It may be thought that the apprehension of rivalry from the Methodists is extravagant and visionary and overstrained; it may be thought too wild a flight even for ambition, to contemplate the seizure of our endowments, the usurpation of our Parish Churches, and the stripping our Establishment of its alliance with the State; it may be thought that it were full as "easy a leap to pluck bright honour from the pale faced moon." But ambition aspires with the eagle, though it soar with the wings of a goose. There is little danger from a conspiracy, when the conspirators kindly inform us of their intentions: but what those intentions are, there is no longer room to doubt. Mark Robinson deprecates the contingency of Methodism becoming the Established Religion of the country, and possessing the ability of demanding temporal supplies, in its *present form*; and one of their leading preachers was heard, it seems, to express a hope in Conference that the time was *not distant*, when Methodism would attain that distinguished pre-eminence, (p. 13.)

Let the established Clergy, therefore, be watchful at their posts; let them redouble their vigilance to counteract the schemes of these schismatics. The time, we trust, is not so near as they seem to hope, when they will be able to shoulder us out of our pulpits, and to denounce us heretics *ex cathedra*, for not obeying Conference: but they have a direct interest, in separating as many as they possibly can, from the Church. Wealth and power, it has been proved, are more objects of solicitude to the travelling preachers, than purity of doctrine, and religious truth: it is their own kingdom, and not Christ's, which they labour to advance. With this view, they compass heaven and earth to make proselytes to their schism; resembling again the Pharisees of old, who took the same pains, because, as Lightfoot quaintly remarks, "the more they could draw over to their religion, the greater draught they should have for gain, and the more purses to fish in." With the wisdom usually observed in the children of this world, they fling away conciliation, and inflame the liberality of their followers with the ardour of sectarian zeal: for they know that the exactions of party spirit will be readily submitted to by those, who would not sacri-

fice a single farthing to the support of simple truth; and that the love of contradiction to established order will open many a hand, which would have been firmly clenched against the appeal of reason. Interested, therefore, as they are, in alienating the minds of the people from the Establishment, some conjecture may be formed, how much it is the object of their direct hostility, from the intolerance with which they are proved to have treated the seceders from their own body. We shall have done our duty to the public, by bringing before them facts so little known in general; and to the Clergy, by warning them of the active war carried on against them every where, by stealing away the affections, as well as the subscriptions, of their flocks: and they who incessantly labour, for their own ends, to subvert the Church, cannot complain, if we endeavour to clip the wings of aspiring envy, and to lower their credit and influence, by exposing their real motives, and pointing out their probable designs.

---

*The Book of the Roman Catholic Church, in a Series of Letters, addressed to Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. on his Book of the Church. By Charles Butler, Esq. pp. 346. Murray. 1824.*

THIS work, like all the writings of Mr. Butler, displays great kindness and courtesy of temper, and an unaffected liberality of sentiment,—and we think that no one has a better right to take for his motto, the golden sentence of St. Francis of Sales, that “a good Christian is never outdone in good manners.” But, we are bound to say, that mere politeness in a controversialist, is no sufficient substitute for want of vigour, and that, with all our love of the civilities and compliments of Mr. Butler, we must whisper in his ear the advice of our old friend Gil Blas to the Archbishop of Grenada—“such works as your’s are not to be criticized—there is nobody but what is charmed with it. However, since you have charged me to be free and sincere, I will take the liberty to tell you that your last discourse does not seem to have the energy of the rest.—Are you not of the same opinion?”

“This work,” we say, “is not to be criticized,”—for how is it possible for a critic to answer at least five hundred questions, and to give an account of eighteen letters, which are broken down into sixty-two sections, and each of which would require at least one of our pages to investigate? So far as any specific charges are made against Mr. Southey, for misquotation or misrepresentation of his authorities, it is his duty to clear himself, and we have no doubt that he will do it satisfactorily. All that we shall attempt is, to give our readers a short account of

the nature and contents of the work before us; and even this must be performed very briefly and rapidly, from the multifarious and miscellaneous matter, which is brought together in its pages.

After an introduction containing remarks on the proper objects of controversy, we have the Creed of Pope Pious IV. with some reflections, tending to shew, that the only documents, for which all Catholics are responsible, as containing the articles of their faith, are the Creed aforesaid, "the Catechism of the Council of Trent," "Bossuet's Exposition of Faith," Gother's "Papist misrepresented and represented," and Challoner's "Three short Summaries of Catholic Faith and Doctrine, prefixed to his *Garden of the Soul*, the most popular Prayer Book of the English Catholics." We know not by what authority Mr. Butler has cited these works as *authorities*: but we feel assured, that save and excepting the Creed of his Holiness, there would be little difficulty for any Catholic to disavow the remainder.

The first letter insists on the magnitude and extent of the Roman Catholic Church, from which rather a hasty inference is drawn, that, if it be in error, "the gates of Hell must have prevailed against the Church." The only flaw in this argument consists in a slight begging of the question, as to the nature of the Christian Church, or, whether, allowing the whole of its geographical extent, it is any demonstrative proof of its being the holy Apostolic Catholic Church. If mere *extent of territory* is to settle the question, then Paganism has the fairest claim to the dignity of Catholicism.

In letters 2, 3, 4, and 5, we have a short narrative of, what the Papists denominate, the "three conversions of England"—the first of which is fabulous, the second dubious, and the third so mixed with legendary lore, that it scarcely can be called historical. In letter sixth, Mr. Butler makes a strong attempt to rescue the character of St. Dunstan. We cannot say that it has at all altered our opinions respecting the imperious and insolent behaviour of that Prelate to his Sovereign; but as the story is related in an entertaining manner, we shall extract it as the most favourable specimen of Mr. Butler's style. After describing the indecorous behaviour of King Edwin in retiring from the presence of his assembled Nobles and Ecclesiastics, on the day of his Coronation, to resign himself to the blandishments of Ethelgiva and Elgiva, Mr. Butler thus goes on to set forth the conduct of the Saint on that occasion.

"The monarch was unwilling to quit the scene of infamy. Dunstan strongly represented to him the consequences of his conduct; dragged him from the embraces of the women; placed the crown upon his head; and returned with him to the banquet. It is surprising that the conduct of Dunstan, on this occasion, should be the subject of modern blame. The monarch had outraged decency, the clergy and nobles

were irritated, and the worst consequences might have followed. Dunstan brought back the unwise youth to the assembly, and thus stifled the discontent.

"But his conduct was resented, both by the king and Ethelgiva. He was banished from the court, confined to his monastery, and threatened with personal violence. Then, with the permission of the earl of Flanders, he retired to the monastery of St. Peter at Ghent; but Edwin and Ethelgiva pursued their vengeance against him. His two abbeys of Glastonbury and Abingdon were dissolved, and the monks expelled from them. Edwin continued his connexions with Ethelgiva: the Wittenagemot, which was both the supreme council, and the supreme judicial tribunal of the nation, took cognizance of it, and threatened Ethelgiva with ignominious punishment, if she should persist in her scandalous conduct. She paid no attention to their representations, and the scandal continued. By the direction of the Wittenagemot, she was branded with a hot iron, and conveyed out of the kingdom. The public discontent increased: all the provinces on the north of the Humber revolted, and transferred their allegiance to Edgar, the brother of Edwin."—

"A civil war ensued: Ethelgiva returned from her banishment, but was seized and murdered by a party of the insurgent soldiers. To put an end to the distraction of the nation, the Wittenagemot interfered, and divided the kingdom between the two brothers. On the death of Edwin, which happened soon after this event, Edgar became the sole possessor of the Anglo-Saxon throne. Modern historians have worked the misfortunes of Ethelgiva and Elgiva, into a very tragic tale, and described Dunstan as the author of their calamities; but must not all who read Dr. Lingard's account of them, and examine his authorities, acknowledge, that the tale is considerably embellished, and wholly acquit Dunstan of having acted any part in it? During the whole of these proceedings, Dunstan was in Flanders."—P. 59.

The seventh letter contains a short apology for the monks, with a defence of investitures, or the claims of the Popes to nominate to vacant Bishoprics. We are sorry to find such a writer as Mr. Butler, falling into the *slang*, by calling Rome, "the Eternal City," and using such strange expressions as these, "permit me to ask, if the Popes were not *founded* in all these objections," &c. He had before spoken of "the dignities and *gaudes* of the world." It is but fair to add, however, that his *style* is generally pure and unexceptionable.

We next come to St. Thomas à Becket, and to the immunities of the Church, and we think that Mr. Butler has made an excuse, if not a defence, for his refusing to obey "the Constitutions of Clarendon." It is true "that Becket perished for a faithful adherence to Ecclesiastical duty;" but this is only shifting off the blame from the individual, to that tyrannical and despotic power, to which he was subservient. "From an humble *fisherman*," says Mr. B., "the Pope successively became the owner of houses and lands, acquired the power of magistracy in Rome," &c. (p. 93.) We are quite at a loss how to in-

terpret this sentence. Does the "humble fisherman" mean the Apostle Peter, or the first individual who took the title of Pope? "Then the Pope," he adds, "did not stop, but claimed, by divine gift, a right to exercise supreme temporal power over all Christian Sovereigns, when a great good of Religion required it. This claim was unfounded—both the Gospel and tradition declared against it." Indeed this was a marvellous proof of his infallibility. Still more strangely he adds, "it produced great evil," and then proceeds to shew, both from argument and authority, that it was productive of extensive benefits to Christendom in general! Is this writing like an historian, or a partizan?

In the tenth letter we have a brief "View of the Roman Catholic system"—in which its peculiar opinions respecting the Virgin Mary—Purgatory—Auricular Confession and Indulgences—the comparative merits of St. Augustine and Pelagius—Transubstantiation—and the Authority of the Pope—are rapidly brought before us. It must be evident to our readers, that we cannot launch on this "vasty deep" of controversy; we therefore prefer at once to proceed to Letter XI. which treats of the rise of the Reformation. Here Mr. Butler more than hints, that the Albigenses, &c. were the lineal descendants of Manes—a strange absurdity, which is not worth refuting, any more than the query which he proposes for Mr. Southey's investigation—"Whether these Sectaries did not, by their disorganizing tenets, *prelude* to the doctrine of liberty and equality, so frightfully propagated in our time?" (p. 140.) In section XI. 2. of this Letter, we have an attempt to defend the *mendicants* by the example of Jesus Christ himself, which is almost entirely confined to interrogations. After misapplying some precepts of Scripture, he asks:

"Do they not imply, that a voluntary renunciation of riches, a voluntary renunciation of our will, and a voluntary renunciation of sensual, but lawful pleasure, are acceptable to God? Do we not imitate, by the first, the voluntary poverty of our holy Redeemer?—by the second, *his voluntary obedience to the will of his eternal Father, and to the will of his Virgin Mother*?—by the third, his immaculate purity?" P. 149.

This may sound pious and devotional to the ears of a Papist, but to us it is a strange compound of nonsense and profaneness; and if we were not shocked by its presumption, we could smile at its absurdity. No one denies the scholastic powers of St. Thomas Aquinas; but it only injures him to compare him to Sir Isaac Newton (p. 152.) Nor does any one question the service, which the religious orders of the Romish Church have afforded to literature—nor the real piety of many of its female devotees; but to call them "celestial beings," (p. 154.) is to caricature their merits. In like manner, we consider that Mr. Butler makes a very poor apology for his Church, by



dwelling on the many *unsuccessful* attempts which had been made *by its own members* to reform it—an argument which has been always adduced by Protestants to shew the necessity of a reformation *from without*. In Letter XII. this period is treated of, and, strange to say, these three questions are asked, and answered in the negative ;—First, “has England gained by the Reformation in temporal happiness?”—Secondly, “has England gained by the Reformation in spiritual wisdom?”—Thirdly, “was the Reformation attended by a general improvement in morals?” We are quite contented to let Mr. Butler have all this dispute to himself, as well as his following queries—“Whether the revival of letters was assisted by the Reformation?—or whether the dissolution of the monasteries was justified by the conduct of the religious orders?” &c. We are persuaded that his friends, Dr. Milner, and Dr. Lingard, will request him to ask no more questions of this kind, unless he can make it appear, that, if the Reformation had not taken place, we should have had nobler Poets than Shakspeare and Milton—deeper Philosophers than Bacon or Newton—more learned Divines than Barrow or Taylor—braver Commanders than Marlborough or Nelson—and more elegant Scholars than Addison or Sir W. Jones. There is nothing to detain us in his account of Edward VI. in the 13th letter; but in the next, we have an apology for Mary's persecutions, and here we must say, that Mr. Butler quite loses his usual good temper, in his abuse of our Martyrologist; and, as a proof of this, we shall cite its conclusion:

“The time is gone by—no good subject now reads with pleasure any abuse of the Roman Catholic Church, or its members. Take it to the admirers of father Fox! his mantle has descended to you! But don't wear it! you are qualified for better things.” P. 214.

For shame, Mr. B. these are not “the good manners” of St. Francis of Sales.

Queen Elizabeth's reign occupies the 15th letter. That great severities were exercised on the Catholics during this reign, we readily admit; but they were called for by their repeated attempts at rebellion and insurrection. Whoever has looked into the work entitled “*Pacata Hibernia, or the Warres of Ireland, during the times of Elizabeth,*” will see that the Papists were indefatigable in their attempts at revolt. But we own that we are both shocked and surprized, at Mr. Butler's apology for the massacre of St. Bartholomew, (p. 251.) and still more by his admission, that the plea was allowed by the *See of Rome*, and yet that the Roman Catholic Church is not justly chargeable with its guilt. Nor are we more pleased with his palliation of the murder of the Prince of Orange (p. 253.) We have again more abuse of our good old Martyrologist (p. 263.) but it will be time enough to be “confident” of Mr. William



Eusebius Andrews' "triumph" over him, when his answer, which is now in course of publication in numbers, has been fully completed. We are glad to find that Mr. Butler allows that a few Catholics were led astray by the *illaudable bulls* of Pope Pius V. (p. 264.); and what is this but giving up the point at issue?

In letter 16, the truth of the Gunpowder/Plot is admitted, though it is hinted, that his researches respecting it, by an examination of the documents in the Paper Office, have been favourable to the Roman Catholic cause. But so long as "The State Trials" are in existence, we think the point admits of but one opinion. Whoever wishes to investigate the subject, should consult Archdeacon Churton's Discourses, or Dr. Falconer's Appendix to his Bampton Lectures.

In letters 17 and 18, the reigns of Charles the 1st and 2nd are briefly considered with regard to the Papists. In the former, we believe that every alleviation was shown them, which the unfortunate Monarch could shew; indeed, we all know that it was one of the chief accusations against him. As to the forgeries of Oates, they are universally admitted; but it is impossible to deny, that, from the private opinions of Charles II. there was no little danger of seeing the restoration of popery in this kingdom.

Having thus laid before our readers as full a summary of Mr. Butler's publication as the limits of our Review will admit, we shall close this article with a general observation on the present state of religious parties in Great Britain and Ireland; from which it will appear, we think, that the real power and the influence of popery is greater amongst us, at this moment, than it has been at any period since the Reformation.

Supposing, then, the whole population of Great Britain and Ireland to be divided into three parts, we should say, (on a rough estimate) that one belonged to members of the Established Church, another to Protestant Dissenters, and another to the Roman Catholics. To all purposes of our argument, we conceive that this calculation will be found sufficiently accurate, because it is our object to shew, that the actual number of Roman Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland (taken together) is nearly the same as that of the members of the Established Church, when distinguished from Protestant Dissenters.

But in any dispute which relates to removing civil or ecclesiastical disabilities from the Papists, it is plain, that we cannot reckon with much confidence on the cordial assistance of Dissenters from our Establishment, because they may be supposed to have the same interests at stake—and this it is which constitutes the real power and influence of the Catholic question. When the case is viewed in this manner, we are confident that

no man can look forward, without some feelings of apprehension, to the future safety of our Church, so far, at least, as to render him very cautious and attentive to all proceedings on this subject. And what still further adds to our difficulties is this—that the situation of religious parties in Great Britain and Ireland is so extremely different. Here the difficulties arise almost entirely from Dissenters, but there from Roman Catholics. Hence results the arduous task of trimming the vessel equally between Scylla and Charybdis—a task, which demands all the care and vigilance of our Governors in Church and State, and which no real friend to the Church will affect to despise or underrate.

Under these circumstances, we earnestly recommend to all our readers to combine the spirit of Protestantism with their professions as Churchmen—ever to maintain the love of liberty, apart from licentiousness—to grasp the Bible with one hand, and their Prayer-Book with the other—and thus to present an unconquerable defence to the superstitions of Romanists, and to the disorders of schismatics. So will our Church thus turn to her favour and advantage the testimonies of her conflicting adversaries. So will the wisdom and moderation of our Reformers be attested at once by *ancient* tyranny, and by *modern* licentiousness. The dangers are great and numerous, but they, in some measure, help to neutralize each other—there is a Providential balance in our favour—and we think that we can discern, even now, a “light springing up in our darkness”—and that ere long our superiority shall become clearly apparent, “even as the noon-day.”

---

### MISCELLANEOUS.

#### \* CORRESPONDENCE OF BISHOP ANDREWES AND DU MOULIN † ON EPISCOPACY.

To the Right Reverend Prelate, the Lord Bishop of Winchester, Peter Du Moulin sends greeting.

The death of your illustrious predecessor ‡ has been a severe affliction

---

\* This curious and interesting correspondence is translated from the original letters in Latin, published in a work entitled, “*Reverendi in Christo Patris, Lanceloti, Episcopi Wintoniensis, Opuscula quædam Posthuma.*”—London, 1629. p. 159—200. A translation of it appeared about the commencement of the troubles in the reign of Charles I. To the best of our recollection it was anonymous, for we happen not to have it at hand to refer to it.

† Du Moulin was born at the Castle of Buy, in Vexin, in 1568, being descended from the ancient and noble family of Brie, said to be related on the female side to Queen Elizabeth. He is characterized by Bayle, “as the most famous Minister that the Protestants of France ever had.” He finished his education at Christ’s College, Cambridge; afterwards became Professor at Leyden, where Grotius was his pupil. He was invited to England in 1613, by King James, who gave him, at his return to France, a Prebend of Canterbury.

‡ James Montague was Bishop Andrewes’s immediate Predecessor in the See of Win-

to your Church and country. Your gracious Sovereign has lost in him a prudent counsellor, and the Church a faithful pastor. I also have to lament a patron and friend, who, though always attentive to what interested me, had won my regard, not so much by immediate proofs of kindness, as by his own high character. I have a letter from him, written when his bodily strength was giving way, and his constitution was impaired beyond recovery: it is a memorial of him which awakens the deepest regret. It has been, however, a source of much consolation to me to hear that you were appointed to succeed him; for I had long admired your learning, and had personally experienced your friendly disposition. Your Sovereign shewed his accustomed discernment in not hesitating to make his choice. You were immediately looked to as the successor by all who knew the soundness of his judgment. And may this event be a blessing to yourself, to the Church, and to your country. God give you virtue increasing with your honours, and freshen and invigorate your old age; so that your gracious King may long enjoy your counsel, and the Church may derive every day greater benefit from your industry and vigilance.

In the work which I have written on the Vocation of Pastors\*, certain passages, have given offence to your King, who is so eminent for his wisdom, on account of their apparent hostility to the Episcopal Office. On the other side, however, my own countrymen complain without reserve, that I have been pleading the cause of Episcopacy, and that I have condemned Aërius† for daring to oppose the universal Church on a point received from ancient times, and in all places. And they are displeased with me for asserting, that it has been customary throughout the Church, from the time of those who succeeded the Apostles, for one of the Presbyters in each city to have the pre-eminence, and be called Bishop.

There are many passages to which the King affixed his mark of disapprobation with his usual wisdom and discernment: but three points principally offended him. The first—that I have represented the names, Bishop and Presbyter, as used in the New Testament indiscriminately. The second—that I have asserted the order of Presbyter to be one and the same with that of Bishop. The third and most important point—my opinion, that the Episcopal pre-eminence (*προστάσις*) is not derived from divine right, is not an article of faith, but only a matter in which the ancient Church freely used its discretion; determining the pre-eminence of one to be the best provision for maintaining

---

chester, but held it only a year and three quarters. Du Moulin must allude to Bilson, who was Bishop of Winchester when he was in England. Andrewes's translation of that see was in 1618.

\* "Incontinent apres les Apostres ou mesme de leur temps (comme l'histoire Ecclesiastique temoigne) la coutume a esté introduite, qu'en une ville un des pasteurs se nommeroit Evêque et auroit pre-eminence sur ses compagnons: afin d'éviter les confusions qui naissent souvent de l'égalité: lequel ordre a esté généralement suivy: les Eglises ayant creu qu'en la disposition de la police Ecclesiastique elles avoyent de la liberté."—Vocation des Pasteurs, 1. 4.

† "Dicebat (Aërius) Presbyterum ab Episcopo nullâ differentiâ debere discerni."—Augustin de Hær. ad Quodv. Hær. 53.

Bishop Hall, Episcopacy by Div. Right, part 2. § 9.—Epiph. Hær. 75.

order and peace; a matter in which churches may differ without any breach of unity.

All this I acknowledge that I have written: but that my words may not be perverted, or unfavourably construed, I will briefly explain to you my meaning. I said, indeed, that the words, Bishop and Presbyter, are used in the New Testament for the same thing; but did not suppose that this assertion detracted from the episcopal dignity, since I spoke of the name alone, not of the office, and am supported in the assertion, not only by many plain passages of Scripture, not only by the Presbyter Jerome, but also by the most celebrated Bishops of the ancient Church—Chrysostom, Ambrose, Theodoret—who did not think themselves wronged, or their dignity at all impaired, if it were believed that the words Bishop and Presbyter were primitively used in the same sense.

I said, also, that the order of Bishop and Presbyter is one and the same; for this was always the opinion of the ancient Church, and is still held by the Church of Rome, although the difference is prodigious between the pomp of her Bishops and the meanness of her Priests. It is from this opinion that we find the Roman Pontifical providing for the consecration and not for the ordination of a Bishop. For order and degree are two different things; men, forsooth, of the same order may differ in degree and dignity, as among Bishops the Archbishop holds an higher degree.

I confess, again, that I asserted the episcopal degree and prerogative to be of ecclesiastical, but not of divine right. But, beside that to speak otherwise than I thought would not have been the part of a wise or honest man, a person of your considerate judgment will easily perceive, that a Frenchman, living under our Church Polity, could not have spoken differently without incurring the censure of our Synods, and without being compelled to recant, under pain of expulsion from the ministry. For to deliver as my opinion that our Churches are in error, both in articles of faith and in a matter of divine right, would be to brand them with the mark of heresy, and would unsettle the conscience of many weak brethren. For my part, I undertook the work in question unwillingly, induced to do so by the earnest and continued entreaties of our Church, in order to repress the insolence of our adversaries, who, in this matter, insult us extravagantly, and speak of us as mushrooms but just born from the earth, or as obscure ruffians who have invaded the pulpit by violence and tumult.

I think, however, that I have so tempered my expressions as to defend our interests without overthrowing your's; and without betraying an excess of party zeal by a spirit of contradiction. Nor have I any where made other than honourable mention of the English Bishops.

I have thought it necessary to say, thus much to you, most excellent Dignitary, whose approbation I especially desire for my writings. I should also have sent you my book long since, if I had not heard from several persons that you do not concern yourself with French literature. I now send it, because I doubt not that, as you will henceforth enjoy more frequent intercourse with your Sovereign, he will

take occasion to converse with you on this subject, and require your opinion. For my part, I shall willingly submit to your judgment, knowing that the most learned are wont to be the most candid, and hoping that you will not cut away to the quick, any thing which may be softened down by a favourable interpretation. And I pray you to consider me as one with whom the authority of antiquity will always have great influence, and who will feel himself sufficiently protected against censure if he meets with but a small share of your approbation. May God preserve you, most honourable Prelate. Farewell.

Your Lordship's devoted servant,

PETER DU MOULIN.

Paris, 5th September, 1618.

### THE BISHOP'S ANSWER.

I had completed this letter in the beginning of March, and was on the point of sending it, when unhappily the ill health of the King obliged me to lay it aside, and wholly disarranged my correspondence. This illness originated in his grief at the death of our gracious Queen, his beloved consort: and, from his neglect of himself through the anguish of his mind, it ended in a disorder so aggravated as to leave the Physicians themselves in great doubt concerning its event. Hence all writing was forgotten, and the sending of my letter was omitted. I had to resort to prayer, with the rest of my countrymen, in utter consternation, as men in danger of being deprived of their excellent monarch. But God regarded us, and restored him to us, and in him restored us to ourselves.

Being then once more myself, I render to you what I confess has been too long owing: so long that Beaulieu might justly have demanded payment of this debt from me in your name, as from a person of doubtful credit. You will, however, I trust, receive this excuse of mine, which is painfully just, in your accustomed friendly manner, and will continue to expect from me all the attentions of a friend.

To come to the subject of your book. You say that some passages in it were offensive to the King. This is not to be wondered at. He has a sensitive mind; which is alive to any such matter of offence. For such is his piety towards God, that the peace and order of the Church, of which he is guardian, are not treated as matters unworthy of his attention: and such his discernment, that he instantly perceived the tendency of your three positions. 1. *The name of Bishop is not distinct from that of Presbyter*:—2. *the order of Bishop is not distinct (nor the thing itself therefore)*:—3. *the whole question is not one of divine right*. For, what are these three positions, but the objections thrown out by men who have lately agitated ourselves? What had they to say, but that *the terms are used indiscriminately*,—that *even the thing is not distinguished*,—and lastly, that *the invention is human*? that is, being instituted by men, it may be abolished also by men, and thus Episcopacy stands or falls at the option of the Civil Power. The King is but too well

acquainted with all this; he has long been accustomed to it all—too long have such accents been ringing in his ears. He knows also that there are remaining among us those, who from your writings will quickly take fresh occasion, not indeed to overthrow our Order, which has struck deeply its roots for so many ages, but certainly to offer it some insult. —The case, moreover, has been aggravated by a certain Bucer, who exactly at the same time, not I believe in concert, yet apparently so, without having received offence or provocation, has edited most inopportunistly, a Latin treatise on the same question. And what King would not be grieved by such things, who desired peace, not only in the Churches of his own dominions, but throughout Christendom, and would give much to purchase it? Be not, therefore, troubled, that the King has objected to those parts of your work. I take upon myself to say, that he would prefer making many marks of praise, especially in a book of yours, to affixing a single note of disapprobation.

These sentiments of the King are, however, as they ought to be, the sentiments of the kingdom in general. Which leads me to appeal to your candour and consideration. You were desirous, you said, of defending your own cause, and repressing the insolence of your adversaries;—and that, if you acted otherwise, you must incur the censure of the Synod, and either retract or look for degradation. We concede this to you; but we ask the same concession for ourselves, that we also may defend our cause as becomes upright and prudent men. For we also have forward adversaries; and we have also consciences, which we do not suffer to be unsettled, with the notion, that they are under an ecclesiastical polity different from that which has existed from the beginning, and from the very age of the Apostles:—and that our's has this antiquity, we are prepared, on any occasion, to prove to the whole Church.

Much, then, do I wish that you had not even alluded to us. For who compelled you? You might have directed your darts against the enemies whom you mention, without their glancing on us: our concerns are not so interwoven with your's but that you might have passed them over in silence, without any difficulty.\* “*Est et fidei tuta silentio Merces.*” If, however, you were fully purposed to introduce into your treatise something relative to our Church, I earnestly wish you had made your intention known to the King, and had consulted him in good time, on that which you designed to write respecting *his* interests; for he accounts our interests as his own. You yourself know, for who does not know it, since he has written so much and so admirably, that he excels in learning and in natural talents, and that, in judgment especially, whether we look for acuteness or solidity, he is among the first, or rather superior to the first. No man has so thoroughly investigated, and taken so accurate account of all that concerns us as he has done. On any subject, and especially in the affairs of our Church and nation, he could have advised you best how far to advance, and to set bounds to your progress when it had reached its proper limit. And if hereafter you undertake any thing of a similar kind, remember, I pray you, this my counsel, dictated by the best consideration for you, and coming from one who knows that the King



esteems you highly—that he has entitled himself to your gratitude, which you will not dispute—and will I trust merit it in future.

If you ask my opinion on the three points in question, I give it you with sincerity. I think that the names, Bishop and Presbyter, are promiscuously used in the sacred writings. I will grant to you, that at first little stress was laid on the terms. Nor is it so much what you have said, as the tendency of your words, that the King regards:—he considers the inference which will hence be quickly caught at by persons, in this and other countries, who are prejudiced against our order—namely, that the expression is equivalent to their being no distinction between the things signified. What other object can be imputed to a writer who dwells upon the confusion of terms, when the things are sufficiently distinguished. No one would attack the name, unless he were not thoroughly well disposed toward the thing itself.

But in this respect the case of the episcopal order is not singular. For in the same authors, and in the very passages to which you refer, there exists the same indiscriminate use of the name Deacon. We have these words of Chrysostom, (Philip. i.) “Even a Bishop was termed *διακονος*. Whence St. Paul, writing to Timothy, although a Bishop, says, fulfil thy *διακονια* \*.” Hence you may collect, that the words Bishop and Deacon were used in the same sense. But, besides this, even the Apostles call themselves in one place Presbyters, in another place Deacons, and their functions they call, accordingly, *διακονια*. Yet neither is a Deacon or Presbyter the same as an Apostle. Why then did you not in addition make it appear, that this community of names affected the other orders also; and that in the early age the names not only of Bishop, but also of Presbyter and Deacon, were promiscuously used; while the things signified, the functions themselves, were nevertheless distinct.

Again, when those authors say, “hitherto they had their names in common,” they also immediately provide a remedy to prevent misinterpretation, and remind the reader that the thing itself is not undistinguished, subjoining, “but since that time each office has had its proper name assigned; the term Bishop to a Bishop; the term Presbyter to a Presbyter †.” No one, speaking with propriety, would insist upon the use of a word in its unrestricted sense, when the restricted use of it has been adopted. No one would now use the word *tyrannus* to denote a King, or the word *latro* to designate a soldier. On the same principle, he would not apply the term Bishop to signify a Presbyter: and if Jerome, when writing what you refer to, had called himself a Bishop, and Augustin a Presbyter, you must be aware, he would have made himself ridiculous.

\* Chrys. Hom. Phil. i. 1. on the words *συνεπισκοποις και διακονοις*.

Τι τωτο; μιας πολιως πολλοι επισκοποι ησαν; νηαμως. αλλα τις πρεσβυτερης ουτως εκαλεισε. τοτε γαρ τις κοινωνων τοις ονομασι και διακονος ο επισκοπος ελεγετο. δια το γραφων και Τιμοθεω ελεγε: την διακονιαν ση πληροφορησων επισκοπων οντι.

† Chrys. Hom. Phil. i. 1.

Λοπων δε, το ιδιαον εκασω απονεμηται ονομα, επισκοπος επισκοπος, πρεσβυτερος πρεσβυτερος.

Add to which, that, in such passages, the Fathers, before they speak of the use of the words, are obliged to lay down and premise that which may place the thing signified out of all controversy. Thus Chrysostom, (in Philip. i.)

"What mean these words? were there several Bishops of one city? Certainly not." That is, not even when St. Paul wrote his Epistle. Thus also Theodoret, (in Philip. i.) "It was not possible that several Bishops should be pastors of one city." Thus Jerome, (in Philip i.) "For there could not be several Bishops in one city." Thus Ambrose, (in 1 Cor. xii. 28.) "God has decreed that one Bishop should preside over one Church\*." Here evidently they proclaim a distinction even then existing in the functions, before they allege any thing concerning the name. I infer, that whatever may have been the case at first with the terms,—the restricted use of them may have been then neglected,—yet in practice, even at the earliest time, there was in one city only one Bishop and Pastor. With us this is still the practice; but is it so with you? If, then, having first stated that the things signified are clearly distinguished, you had afterwards noticed in the second place the indiscriminate use of the names, which once, though but for a short time, prevailed, (although what good end could have been answered by disputing about names, when the things themselves are certain?) and had avoided making so crude a statement on the subject,—the King, I think, would not have affixed his note of censure on that passage.

We come next to the question concerning Order. Consider, first of all, whether the order ought to be called the same when the functions are not the same. And that the functions, in the present case, are not the same, is acknowledged even by those who little favour Episcopacy; for they always except ordination from the official duties of a Presbyter. Consider, secondly, whether the order ought to be called one and the same, when the imposition of hands is not one and the same, but new and distinct. For no one, I think, will deny that, throughout all antiquity, Bishops have been appointed with imposition of hands. And that the ancient Church regarded the order as distinct, let Isidorus † testify, who has expressly said, "the episcopal order."

If you refer the question to the school authors, they do not agree one with another. Your countryman, Altisiodorensis,—our countryman, Major, and others, support the distinction of the order. Those who are less favourable to the distinction, do not, indeed, consider the admission to it as a sacrament of orders, for they hold no ordination to be sacramental but that which gives power to administer the Eucharist: nevertheless they assign an order to Bishops; order being, according to their definition, the possession of power to perform some special act; suppose, the act of ordination, to which Bishops alone are competent. For what would it be, to deny that to be an order from which ordination itself, and, of course, all orders of the ministry are derived?

\* "Et quia ab uno Deo patre sunt omnia singulos episcopos singulis ecclesiis præse decrevit." Amb. in 1 Cor. xii. 28.

† Isid. Hisp. Etym. 7. 12.

As to the Church of Rome and its Pontificate, we regard them not. If they are pleased with the term *consecration*, let them enjoy it forthwith. But formerly even the Church of Rome held different language: "The Church of Rome," says Tertullian, (de Prescr. 32.) "declares that Clement was ordained by Peter \*." Different also was the language of the Fathers, of those even to whom you refer: even Jerome (de Scrip. 2.) asserts, "that James, the brother of the Lord, was ordained a Bishop immediately after our Lord's passion †;" and says of Timothy, (Hieron. in 1 Tim. 4.) "Timothy possessed the gift of prophecy, together with the ordination of Episcopacy ‡." In like manner Ambrose (in 1 Tim. iii. 8.) says, "It was not lawful for the inferior to ordain the superior §;" that is, for the Presbyter to ordain the Bishop. And Chrysostom: (in Philip. i.) "the Presbyters would not have ordained the Bishop||." For the Latin word *ordinatio* answers to the Greek χειροτονια, and is generally used to render it; and nothing is more frequent than the use of χειροτονια where the appointment of Bishops is spoken of. And so Theodoret speaks of "Titus, ordained Bishop of Crete by St. Paul \*\*." (Æcum. in præf. Tit.)

But you say order is one thing, degree another. You must, however, be aware, that in the Holy Scriptures these words are used indiscriminately, not less than the words Bishop and Presbyter. For there the office of Deacon is called a degree (βασις); and I know you will not deny this to be an order. In the Fathers also, you are aware, you may repeatedly read of a Deacon or Presbyter, not less than a Bishop, being displaced from his degree (βασις ἐκπίπτειν). Indeed every order is a degree; but the converse is not true. In the episcopal rank, however, there is both a distinct order and a distinct degree: but it is an order in one respect and a degree in another. It is a degree, inasmuch as it is a certain superiority, independently of power. It is an order inasmuch as it is a power to perform a special act. If it had been only a degree, the title πρεσβυτατος, which denotes the degree next above Presbyter, would have been sufficient for it, and there would have been no need of seeking elsewhere the new designation of a Bishop for a mere difference in degree. As to the distinction of Archbishops, it is made on a different principle: Archbishops are not endued with power to perform any special act. If not already Bishops, they receive ordination from Bishops. And Archbishops, as such, are not required for the ordination of Bishops: but, by the fourth Canon of the Nicene Council, "three Bishops suffice to perform the ordination."

\* "Sicut Romanorum, (Ecclesia) Clementem a Petro ordinatum (refer)." Tertull. Præser. Hæc. 32.

† "Jacobus—post passionem Domini statim ab Apostolis Hierosolymorum Episcopus ordinatus." Hieron. de Scrip. 2.

‡ "Prophetiæ gratiam habebat cum ordinatione Episcopatus." Hieron. in 1 Tim. iv.  
§ "Neque enim fas erat aut licebat ut inferior ordinaret majorem." Ambr. 1 Tim. iii. 8.

|| "Οὐκ ἂν ἔτι πρεσβυτεροὶ ἐπισκοποῦν χειροτονήσαν." Chrys. Hom. Phil. i. 1.  
\*\* "Ἐπίσκοπος δὲ τῆς Κρήτης μεγίστης ἡσθς κεχειροτονητο ὑπο τοῦ Παύλου." Theod. Æcum. præf. Tit.

Again: we know that the Apostles and the seventy-two Disciples composed two orders distinct from one another. We know, also, that Bishops and Presbyters are constantly regarded by the Fathers as after their model. Bishops as succeeding to the Apostles, and Presbyters to the seventy-two Disciples. And in instituting them they consider that our Lord instituted these two orders. For Cyprian says, "Deacons ought to recollect how the Lord himself chose Apostles, that is, Bishops and Presidents: but Deacons were appointed by the Apostles for themselves after our Lord's ascension, as attendants upon their episcopal office and upon the Church\*." Even Jerome says, "Bishops occupy among us the place of the Apostles†." And in another passage, "They all (Bishops understood) are successors of the Apostles‡." There is also a remarkable passage of Jerome §, as also of Augustine||, on Psalm xlv. 17\* in which the words, "instead of thy fathers thou shalt have children," are paraphrased, "instead of Apostles, Bishops." Ambrose on 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29. says, "He therefore constituted the Apostles chief in the Church"—they are Bishops, according to the Apostle Peter—"and his bishopric let another man take\*\*." And shortly afterwards he says, "Are all Apostles? It is true they are not; because in one Church there is but one Bishop††." And again, on Ephes. iv. 11. "Apostles are Bishops‡‡."

We may hence pass on to the last point, whether this order be of divine right. I was rejoiced to find you saying, that the authority of antiquity will always be great with you. I thank you for this declaration: nor will it be the least reason for praising you, if your conduct shall be found to answer your professions. For my part, such has always been my impression—such my feeling.

Now either the whole history of antiquity greatly deceives me, or it is a fact that Apostolic men, that is to say, Disciples of the Apostles, or as Eusebius calls them, ὁμιληταὶ §§—some of them not mentioned

\* "Mimissime autem Diaconi debent quoniam Apostolos, id est episcopos et præpositos, Dominus elegit; diaconos autem post ascensum Domini in cælos apostoli sibi constituerunt, episcopatum sui et ecclesiæ ministros." Cypr. Ep. 65. Ad Rogatium.

† "Apud nos Apostolorum locum episcopi tenent." Hieron. Epist. 54. ad Marcellum.

‡ "Potentia dirigitur et paupertatis humilitas vel subliniorem vel in priorem Episcopum non facit. Ceterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt." Hieron. Enagrio, Ep. 85.

§ "Fuerunt a ecclesia Apostoli patres tui quia ipsi te genuerunt. Nunc autem quia illi recesserunt a mundo habes pro his Episcopos filios qui a te creati sunt." Hieron. in Psalm xlv. 17. (Psalm xlv. Engl. Trans.)

|| "Quod est pro patribus tuis nati sunt tibi filii. Patres missi sunt Apostoli: pro Apostolis filii nati sunt tibi constituti sunt Episcopi." August. in eundem locum.

\*\* "Caput itaque a Ecclesiâ Apostolos posuit—

"Ipsi sunt Episcopi primanti istud Petro Apostolo et dicenta inter cætera de Judâ 'Et Episcopatum ejus accipiet alter.'" Ambr. in 1 Cor. xii. 28.

†† "Nunquid omnes Apostoli? Verum est: quia in Ecclesia unus Episcopus est."—Id. Ibid.

‡‡ "Apostoli Episcopi sunt." Ambr. in Eph. iv.

§§ Διεπρεπε γε μὴν κατὰ τῆς ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὁμιλητῆς Πολυκαρπὸς τῆς κατὰ Σμύρναν ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τῶν αὐτοπτῶν καὶ ὑπηρέτων τοῦ Κυρίου τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἐγκειμένους.

in Holy Scripture, as Polycarp and Ignatius; others, there expressly named, as Timothy, Titus, and Clement, were Bishops while the Apostles lived, and what is more, were appointed by the Apostles; Polycarp by St. John, Clement by St. Peter, Titus and Timothy by St. Paul. Of this I produce testimony as follows:

Concerning Polycarp: Irenæus, iii. 3. quoted by Eusebius iv. 14.—Tertullian de Præscr. 32.—Eusebius iii. 36. ed. Reading.—Jerome de Scriptoribus 17.

Concerning Ignatius: Eusebius iii. 36 and 22.—Jerome de Scrip. 16. Concerning Timothy: Eusebius iii. 4.—Jerome de Scrip.—Ambrose præf. in 1 Tim.—Chrysostom in Phil. i.—Epiphanius Hær. 75.

Concerning Titus: Eusebius iii. 4.—Ambrose præf. in Tit.—Theodoret præf. in Tit. in the Commentary of Ecumenius.

Concerning Clemens: Tertullian Præscr. 32.—Eusebius iii. 15.—Jerome de Scrip.

I might also produce equal testimony concerning others; namely, Linus, Dionysius, Onesimus, Epaphroditus, Caius, Archippus\*.

Nor are these the only instances: the Evangelist Mark was a Bishop, and that during the very life-time of the Apostles. For Mark died in the eighth year of Nero, five years before the Apostles Peter and Paul were crowned with martyrdom. Nor was he the only one—the Apostle James was himself a Bishop.

Concerning Mark we have the testimony of Jerome, Præf. in Matth. and Præf. in Marc.

Concerning the Apostle James: that of Eusebius ii. 1. and vii. 19. using the authorities of Clemens and Hegesippus.—Jerome de Scrip. 2.—Chrysostom, Hom. on Acts xv. 12, 14, 15.—Ambrose in Galat. i. 2.—Epiphanius, Hæres. 66.—Augustin. contra Cresconium, ii. 37.

Shall any one then be offended with you for saying that Episcopacy has been received in the Church from the times next to the Apostolic? You have rather said too little; you might have said more, and that with the authority of antiquity—you might have said, in immediate succession from the very Apostles themselves; and what is more, that Apostles themselves were placed in the episcopal office. In this assertion there would have been no ground of offence; except perhaps, that you ought to have said, that the *office existed*, instead of speaking only of the *name*. For we have no dispute about the *name*, but about the *thing*.

Now, either this was the case, or we must make one blot on all the writers of ecclesiastical history. If we enquire, when was all this done? Eusebius† *cap* answer, "After the ascension of the Saviour;" and Jerome‡, "Immediately after the passion of the Lord." If it be

\* Linus—Eusebius iii. 4.

Dionysius—Eusebius iii. 4. and iv. 23.—Jerome de Scrip.

Onesimus—Eusebius iii. 36.

Epaphroditus—Theodoret in 1 Tim. iii. 1.

Caius—Origen in Rom. xvi.

Archippus—Calvin Inst. iv. 3. 7.—Eusebius.

† Euseb. ii. 1.

‡ Hieron de Ser. 2.

enquired, by whom? Tertullian\* can answer, "Constituted in the episcopal office by the Apostles;" Epiphanius, "By the Apostles;" Eusebius†, "By the servants of the Lord;" Jerome‡, "Ordained by the Apostles;" Ambrose§, "Constituted by the Apostles." Will, then, any one deny that James, Mark, Titus, or Clement, were Bishops by Apostolic right? Was any Apostolic act done by a *right* not Apostolic? But Apostolic right I consider to be divine: for nothing was done by the Apostles which was not dictated to them by the Holy and Divine Spirit. At least, if appointed by the Apostles, they were appointed by the same *right* as were those seven, whose appointment even yourself will grant to be of divine right. Deacons they are no where called in Holy Scripture, that title being merely adopted by the Church.

I presume that what was done by the Apostles was done by divine right; and that it cannot be denied that their acts, (supposing them well authenticated,) and not their discourses or writings alone, were of divine right; and that not only St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians||, but those things which he set in order when he came, however little we know of them, were of *equal right*, that is, both by *divine right*, both proceeding from the Holy Spirit. Nor yet are they *therefore* to be reckoned articles of faith; for they regard things which are to be done in the Church, and cannot properly be reckoned among things to be believed, or articles of faith.

I wonder to find you saying, that your countrymen complain of you without reserve; first, for pleading the cause of Episcopacy; which seems as if your countrymen were adverse to Bishops, unwilling to hear them defended, and desirous that they should be cast in their cause; and secondly, for condemning Aërius, whom Epiphanius\*\* condemned long ago in Asia, Philastrius in Europe, and Augustin in Africa; whose name stands in the black book of heretics throughout the world; and stands there deservedly, for his daring, as you yourself acknowledge, to oppose himself to the consent of the universal Church. They then are the most to be complained of, who complain of you on such grounds as these.

As for the keenness of criticism which you deprecate—no one intends it: otherwise the very title of your work is objectionable††, in both the words *Pastor* and *Vocation*. Both of these, as you apply them,

\* Tertullian de Præsc. Hær. 32. "Edant ergo origines Ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem Episcoporum suorum ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis vel Apostolicis viris qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverit habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ census suos deferunt sicut Smyræorum Ecclesia Polycarpum ab Joanne collocatum refert: sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum idem. Perinde utique et cæteræ exhibent quos ab Apostolis in episcopatum constitutos Apostolici seminis traduces habeant."

† Euseb. iii. 36.

§ Ambr. in Gal. i. 19.

‡ Hieron. de Serip. 2.

|| 1 Cor. xi. 34.

\*\* Eph. Hær. 75.—Aug. de Hær. 53.—Philast. in Bibliotheca Patrum.—See also Bishop Hall, Episcopacy by Divine Right, part ii. sect. 19.

†† De la Vocation des Pasteurs. Par Pierre Du Moulin, Ministre de la Parole de Dieu en l'Eglise de Paris. Sedan, 1618.



are innovations, known to none but this present century, and only to a part of this. Who among the ancients ever applied them in such a sense? The title *Pastor*, you will find, is scarcely ever used by them, excepting when they speak of Bishops; which use of the word St. Peter taught them, when he connected the titles *Pastor* and *Bishop* in speaking of our Saviour. And you will not meet with any instance in which they have used this word to designate those who, either in the cities or in the country, had the cure of certain portions of the people, divided by parishes: but that *Presbyters* (urban or rural) were deputed by the Bishops for this office. For, in the primitive age, *Presbyters* formed a part of the Bishop's family, and received their daily subsistence from the Bishop's household, before the modern distinction of parishes.

The word *Vocation*, too, in the sense adopted by you, is equally foreign to the language of the Fathers, who use instead of it *ordaining*, or *constituting*.

The very name, too, of *Minister*, by which you designate yourself, is a word of the same character: the Fathers would not have understood it, unless when used to denote a *Deacon*; as corresponding with the Greek *διακονος*. But you must be pardoned: you are forced to speak in the idiom of your own Church, which has no Bishops, and has different *Presbyters*, different *Deacons*, and, I may add, a different *vocation*, from those which the ancient Church acknowledged.

For my part, I, most sincerely, and particularly desire, both for yourselves and all the reformed Churches, that all points of faith may continue to you established as they now are, but that in matters of discipline God may grant to you a Church Polity not differing from that with which he has blessed us; namely, the spiritual government of Bishops, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*, such as we find in the History of the Church, in the Synods, and in the ancient Fathers. To these, unless self-love greatly deceives me, our's are as nearly as possible, conformed—conformed, I mean, in constitution, not in merit; though I would that they resembled them in this also. Nor do I think that the constitution of any Church on earth accords better with the intent of Scripture, or with the practice and order of the primitive Church, than that which flourishes in our country.

I send you what I have here written, that if you please you may keep it by you. Be assured, moreover, that I have always been a lover of peace, both from temper and from principle. This disposition is also required by my time of life, which warns me to prepare for my departure;—and is especially required in the subject of a King who takes for his motto those words of our Saviour—"Blessed are the peacemakers." I engage, too, that I will never side with the severe, and never consent to measures which are not moderate. And I will, as far as I can, put favourable constructions on your words. For it is with us, as it was with Augustin, whose sentiment it is: "It is one thing that we inculcate, and another that we experience."

(To be continued.)

To the Editor of the *Christian Remembrancer*.

SIR,

I HAVE just read the letter of your Correspondent "J. H.," in reply to mine signed "Criticus," on the words of Scripture *συ ληγεις* and *συ νηπας*, and my thanks are due to him for the temperate and gentlemanly style, in which he has treated the subject. In many points we perfectly agree. In the first place, I never questioned the *sense* of these words, as indeed he admits. They are clearly affirmations. Negations they cannot be, and the idea of their being equivocal cannot for a moment be entertained. The sense of them is, therefore, rightly given, by supplying the Ellipsis, as he proposes, by the adverbs *ευ*, *καλως*, *ορθως*.

Still, I cannot help thinking, that such reference to Greek idiom is not the most proper and direct way of explaining the expressions in question.

I admit that the *meaning* of them is thus rightly given. I admit also, that in the passages, which J. H. has adduced from the Dramatic writers (passages certainly much more to the purpose, than those which are commonly referred to on this point) the Ellipsis after *ληγεις* is "manifestly affirmative." But there is a peculiarity in the use and force of these expressions in the New Testament, that is to say, in Jewish or Hebrew Greek, which to my mind savours strongly of Hebrew origin.

The opinion of Michaelis I stated before. He thinks that our Saviour answered *כן דברת*, which he considers an affirmation, and thence deduces the affirmative force of *λεγκας*, *συ νηπας*, *συ ληγεις*, &c. in Jewish Greek.

Perhaps I have gone too far in asserting, in my former letter, that no light can be thrown upon the passages under consideration, by reference to Greek idiom, or to Greek Classic Writers. I ought to have said, by reference to such passages, as are commonly adduced in illustration of them—e. g. *εφη ο Οροδης*—"φημ' *εγω* †—*συ δε ταυτα ληγεις, ουκ εγω* ‡—all of which are irrelevant, some, "not only indecisive, but implying dissent," as J. H. admits.

The passages which he adduces, do, I readily own, throw light on the Scripture expressions, and serve to illustrate them. They did not occur to me, while the impertinency of the others was often in my mind.

In the first, however, from Sophocles, the *τι* is emphatic after *λεγω*,—"λεγω *τι*;"—and this gives the force *ληγεις τι*, which is equivalent to *ληγεις ευ*, or *τα αληθη*, to Creon's answer, "*ληγεις*."

But without entering into any critical examination of these places, I repeat that I agree with your correspondent J. H. in the meaning of these, as well as in the meaning of the Scripture phrases, *συ νηπας*, and *συ ληγεις*.

I agree with him also in his remarks on the style of the Writers of the

\* By Marsh.

† By Schleusner.

‡ By Wetstein and Parkhurst.

New Testament, and on the manner of interpreting it, and ascertaining its sense.

If we differ, it is on *this* point, (and after all I may be in error)—that the expressions in question, have, in the language of the New Testament, a peculiar force and character, and that most probably, by derivation from Hebrew expressions, of assent and affirmation, which they nearly resembled. In a word, were I asked how *our* Saviour, evidently meaning to give a direct and solemn affirmation, came to use (according to the rendering of the Evangelists) the expressions *συ λεγεις*—*συ πας*,—I should not say in reply, such expressions are direct affirmations in the Greek language; but they are *Hebraisms*, having the force of an affirmation, and to be explained most directly as Hebraisms; although expressions somewhat similar are to be met with in the Greek writers, serving to illustrate them.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

H. R. M.

January 8, 1825.

### NONJURING CLERGY.

*To the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer.*

SIR,

It has long been a subject of regret, that we have no good history of the Nonjuring Clergy. However mistaken their principles might be, yet the manner in which they abandoned their preferment to preserve their consciences, at least deserves applause. I therefore hope, that some of your correspondents may be induced to turn their attention to the subject, and to collect whatever can be now gleaned relative to the Nonjurors. If a general enquiry was instituted, sufficient materials might be collected to form a complete history, which would most probably fill a volume. The number of Nonjuring Clergy, exclusive of the dignitaries, did not much exceed two hundred, and if their names could be recovered, and likewise the livings they possessed, the necessary particulars could be easily transmitted to any person desirous of undertaking the work. The time when the Nonjurors flourished is not so distant, but that private memorials respecting them may yet be obtained, and a diligent search of parish registers, as well as the registers of the respective dioceses, would supply whatever might be necessary as to the dates of institution and deprivation. The life of Archbishop Sancroft, by Dr. D'Oyly, may be considered as the commencement of the history now recommended. In the hope that this notice may attract the attention of some of your readers,

I remain, yours, &c.

A. B.

York, December, 1824.

### AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

RECENT accounts from America represent the General Theological Seminary as increasing in the number of its students, and receiving

daily accession to its funds. The Board of Managers pursuing their own high principled course, have been making appeals in its behalf to the Members of their own communion, throughout the several Dioceses of the United States, and a better criterion of the feeling of Episcopalians towards that Institution cannot be put forth than the fact, that from three or four towns of Maryland alone, throughout the whole of which State those, who are upon the *divide et impera* policy, had prognosticated that "not a dollar would be collected," upwards of six thousand dollars have been received.

In close alliance with the Theological Seminary are the *Protestant Episcopal Missionary Societies*, formed in several of the Dioceses, not for the purpose of spreading the Gospel in foreign parts (an indispensable duty when the religious wants at home have been provided for), but for the discharge of that primary obligation, the enlightening more and more the dark places of their own land; and as population advances, affording to the several masses of it, all the benefits of those legitimate and orderly ministrations which the Church only can supply. In the Diocese of New York alone, twenty-one Clergymen are now promoting this truly Christian object, under the auspices of its Diocesan Society; and such has been the success of this wise course of proceeding, that the furthest limits of the State of New York (five hundred miles from the Capital), have now been brought under Episcopal superintendence, and parishes are gradually forming throughout the whole of the intervening country.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer.*

SIR,

I SHALL feel particularly obliged by your insertion of the following circumstances relative to my beloved brother, late Vicar of Polesworth, in the county of Warwick, as being alike creditable to him, and highly honourable to the feelings of his Parishioners, amongst whom he had resided little more than four years at the time of his premature decease

In the first instance, they voluntarily incurred the whole expense of covering the desk and pulpit, and the Vicar's pew, with superfine black cloth; and shortly afterwards they entered into a subscription for the purpose of erecting a handsome Mural Tablet to the memory of their dear deceased Vicar, within the walls of their Church! Such is the result of their liberal and warm feelings, in token of respect and regard for the memory of my brother; and such is the *very rare and honourable example* which they hold out to all other members of the Church of Christ, in proof of that affectionate attachment which ought always to subsist between Minister and people, from the happy influence of pastoral exertions on the well-disposed minds of a Christian congregation! I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

SPENCER MADAN.

*Close, Lichfield, Jan. 17, 1825.*

The Tablet is of white marble, 5 feet by 3, beautifully executed by Mr. Brown, of Derby, and erected over the south door of the Church, with the following inscription :

Sacred  
to the Memory of  
the Rev. WILLIAM MADAN, M.A.  
late Vicar of this Parish,  
and formerly Student of Christ Church, Oxford,  
(where he was admitted B.A. with the highest Academical Distinction ;)  
This Tablet is erected by his grateful Parishioners,  
To whom he was not less endeared  
By his Talents, his Integrity, his Benevolence,  
His unassuming Manners, and Christian Humility,  
than by the faithful, zealous, and exemplary Discharge of all his  
Parochial Duties,  
and the fervent Piety with which he inculcated  
the pure and Apostolic Doctrines  
of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

He died April 17, 1824. Aged 31 Years.  
"An unspotted life is old age." Wisdom iv. 9.

## MONTHLY REGISTER.

### SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

#### LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

At a general Meeting of the Society, on Tuesday, January 11th,

Amidst the other business of the day, a vote of thanks was unanimously passed to the Lord Bishop of Chester, for his late very useful exertions throughout his diocese in promoting the interests of the Society.

The Venerable the Archdeacon of London, in proposing the vote of thanks to his Lordship, observed, that he did not rise merely to suggest an expression of gratulation to the excellent individual, who had so strongly attracted the notice of the Society on his late elevation to the highest office of the Church, though there was much that he might say on that account ;—he might allude to the distinguished course by which he had advanced to his present dignity—to his eminent usefulness as a parochial minister—or to his bright career at the University—that place, above all others, where borrowed plumes were useless, and where every man found his place by his own specific gravity—but this was

not the object of his present motion—he considered some return was due to the Bishop of Chester for services rendered—which had been peculiarly valuable—his Lordship having obtained, by his immediate personal labours in convening meetings and laying the claims of the Society fairly and fully before the Public, in the course of the last few months, no less a sum than 1500*l.*—500*l.* of which were annual subscriptions. It would demand, he said, the abilities of his Lordship himself, for him to do justice to the merits to which he called the attention of the meeting—he should not attempt therefore to dilate on this topic—but would only repeat that he considered "the thanks of the Society due to his Lordship for essential services conferred by him."

The Lord Bishop of Llandaff seconded the motion, adding, that he could not be satisfied to give a silent vote on such an occasion, but took a pleasure in expressing how cordially he concurred in the motion which had been submitted to the meeting.

The question was then formally put by the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, who was in the Chair, and carried with very great approbation.

## MANCHESTER DISTRICT.

A meeting of the members and friends of this Society was held on Monday, the 13th December, 1824, in the Free Grammar School of Manchester, for the purpose of "taking into consideration what further measures might be expedient for rendering the exertions of the Manchester and Salford District Committee of the Society more efficient, and especially for more generally supplying the poorer inhabitants of these towns and their neighbourhood with Bibles, Common Prayer-books, and religious Tracts, at reduced prices.

The Lord Bishop of the Diocese entered the room at ten o'clock, and after the usual prayers of the Society, proceeded to address the meeting.

In entering upon the duties of his pastoral office in this populous and extensive diocese, his Lordship observed, he felt to the fullest extent, he believed, the great weight and responsibility which had been imposed upon him. Among the numerous objects of his solicitude, almost his first inquiry was, as to the disposition felt in the manufacturing districts to propagate the sacred truths of religion among the lower classes; and in the pursuit of that inquiry, his attention was particularly directed to the condition of that Society on behalf of which they were at present assembled. He had fondly anticipated that here he should find that the public liberality had been shown in favour of this Society, in a degree fully commensurate with its worth—that in a town, not more distinguished for its commercial prosperity than for its loyalty, its constitutional attachment to the throne of these realms, and for its veneration for our excellent Church Establishment, he should have the happiness of finding that the Society had been adequately encouraged and supported. But judge of his astonishment and regret, when he discovered from the statement of the Society's accounts and condition, that in these very towns, containing a population amounting, he understood, to nearly 200,000, the actual number of subscribers to the District Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was less than one hundred! Why, he would ask, was it so, when other religious societies,

which, to allow them their full share of merit, could not be compared with this Society in point of usefulness, (as auxiliaries to that Church which we believe to be the depository of true religion), were in so flourishing a condition?

Why, amidst so large a number of religious institutions, should one so valuable as this have been permitted to languish, when it ought to have been warmly and cordially supported?

The cause he believed he had discovered, and he was almost ashamed of mentioning it. The town did not appear to be wanting in attachment to the Established Church—the crowded congregation which assembled in the parish church on Sunday, and not more crowded than attentive and devout, were a demonstrative proof that this was not the case. No, it was not a want of regard for the Church that caused the Society he was advocating to languish: he could attribute it only to an ignorance of its merits. Nor, indeed, he was bound to say, was this ignorance confined to this district; for even in the neighbourhood of his own residence in the metropolis, within the very verge and sphere of the Society's exertions, he had recently found that hundreds of persons, sincere members of the Church, knew nothing of its existence, and that a still greater degree of ignorance prevailed as to its objects. This might have arisen from carelessness, or from misrepresentation, to the source of which he would not now allude; and probably the same cause might have produced similar effects here. Under other circumstances, he should not have ventured to trespass upon their time, by entering into a detail of the origin, objects, and operations of the Society; but, as it was, he felt it necessary to offer a few words in explanation of these points.

The Society was established in 1699, by several distinguished individuals, for the purpose of counteracting the evils with which the country was then threatened, by the dissemination of Popish principles and infidel publications; and of promoting among the people the growth of true Christian knowledge. Shortly afterwards it was considered expedient to separate the Society into two branches, one of which, under the



title of "the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts," was incorporated by charter. This Society had proceeded steadily up to the present time, in the discharge of the sacred trust reposed in it; and with the aid of Government (though not to the extent to which he should have wished), had sent out to different parts not less than two hundred Christian Ministers, to preach the saving truths of the Gospel in the North American colonies.

The objects of the other Society, namely, "the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," were, the propagation of Christian truth at home—the foundation and encouragement of Charity Schools—and the sending of Missionaries to foreign parts—the distribution of the Holy Scriptures, the Book of Common Prayer, and other books explanatory of the doctrines of the Established Church. For many years the exertions of the Society were extremely limited, by the straitness of its means. Indeed, it was well known, that the increased demand for the Scriptures commenced only within the last few years; and he must here take leave to say, that in a great degree the present wide diffusion of the Word of God was attributable, under the Divine blessing, to the exertions of this Society; in the hands of the Lord it had been the earliest institution to aid the Established Church—in directing the minds of the people to the sacred truths of religion. This Society was also the first to stand forward in that labour of love, the religious education of the children of the poor. It laid the foundation of that noble and comprehensive scheme of charity which had been developed by the National School Society—a monument of piety, whose praises would be written in the annals of our country in characters of light. And although that Society had now taken upon itself this department of Christian charity, yet he it remembered, that the National Schools throughout the kingdom were supplied with religious and useful books by "the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." So that upwards of three hundred thousand children were even now indirectly imbibing the pure streams of knowledge at the hands of this Society.

This institution has extended considerable support to Missionaries in foreign parts. His Lordship said, he did not feel disposed to press the claim of the Society as being the earliest to take the charge of Missionaries abroad; their operations had been, in a degree, limited, owing to the want of funds; but they continued to prosecute this good work to the extent of their ability, and were still labouring in this part of the vineyard of the Lord. In the southern parts of India much good had been done through the instrumentality of the Society's Missionaries; and he believed that not fewer than 20,000 Christians in these parts might be regarded as the fruits of their exertions. District Committees had been formed, and are in active operation, at the seats of government, and principal stations in the Indian peninsula; great numbers of religious books had been printed in the country, and distributed, together with still greater numbers sent from home; and a considerable number of schools had been established in the neighbourhood of Calcutta, which were well attended by the children of the natives.

The chief object of this Society, however, was, the dissemination of religious books, including the Holy Scriptures. Not one person in the meeting, he was sure, would call in question the great necessity there was of distributing the Bible; but still he saw no reason why, as members of the Established Church, the meeting should not attach its full importance to the Book of Common Prayer. Was he called upon to say, at the present time, when so much inconsistency and contrariety in discipline and in doctrine prevailed, that there was no need to introduce a help to the right interpretation of the Scriptures? Was it sufficient to acquire a knowledge of the rudiments of Gospel truth only, and leave the superstructure unfinished? He would contend, that it was our especial duty, as sincere members and supporters of the Church of England, to use our best exertions in disseminating such books as would enable our fellow-men to interpret the word of God aright; and to answer this desirable purpose, and to instruct their minds, he knew of no better book than the Common Prayer. And he was

sure the candid seceder would admit the propriety and the justice of their pursuing this course; for he believed that no liberal nonconformist would maintain, that a man might not become a sincere Christian, by acting up in all things, to the doctrines set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

Next to the laborious exertions of the Clergy, the operations of this Society might be the means of bringing again within the pale of the Church, many individuals who had left it. Why not, then, stand up in defence of our mother Church, and try openly, but fairly and kindly, to reclaim our seceding brethren?

He felt deeply impressed with the inconsistency which presented itself in this place. While the Ministers of the Gospel were officiating in the house of God, they were surrounded by thousands of hearers, exhibiting every appearance of attention and zeal; and yet, to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, whose object was the dissemination of genuine Church principles, not a hundred subscribers were found in these extensive and populous towns! So impressed was he with the importance of the subject, that he could not resist further trespassing upon their attention. He should mention a fact, and it ought to be sufficient to induce the meeting to come forward in support of the Society. The number of books distributed during the last fourteen years amounted to nearly *fifteen millions*, a great portion of which were the Holy Scriptures and a great portion Prayer Books. But, that he might not be considered as attaching too much importance to this fact, he would add, and he could state it from his own personal knowledge, that the demand for Prayer Books was commensurate with the demand for the Holy Scriptures, the people at home and abroad very loudly calling for the Book of Common Prayer; and at this moment so great was the demand for it in India, that a corresponding supply could not be procured. They could not therefore be charged with a forced distribution of the Prayer Book. There was, he repeated it, a demand for that excellent book. It was, therefore, the duty of the members of the Established Church to come forward and

endeavour to answer that demand. The blessed fruits proceeding from the distribution of this and other books issued by the Society, we now had the happiness of enjoying. The meeting well knew the mischievous effects that were attempted to be produced a few years ago by the circulation of infidel publications, calculated to shake the attachment of the people to our venerable institutions in Church and State. For the failure of these efforts of the great enemy to mankind, we owed most especially our thanks to God; but no inconsiderable praise was due to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, who, in this hour of threatened danger, appropriated a large sum of money in the printing and circulating of nearly a million of anti-infidel publications. The happy result of this measure, under God's blessing, they all well knew. Had he not, then, his Lordship said he would ask, established the indefeasible claims of this Society to the liberal support of the public? Was the dissemination of the Scriptures to be considered as the work of the Clergy exclusively? and were they to go through this duty without any assistance from the Laity? This ought not to be the case. He would, therefore, call upon the meeting to assist in this work; there was an ample field for their exertions: he would intreat them to co-operate in the zealous endeavours of the Society to reclaim sinners, and to furnish them with an accurate knowledge of the sacred truths of the Gospel—to come manfully forward, and perform the duties of soldiers of Christ's militant Church; not to interfere with the constituted teachers of the Word in the work of the ministry, but to assist them in placing in the hands of the people the materials of religious and useful knowledge. Without casting the slightest imputation on any Christian Association, or questioning their motives or their principles, he would earnestly call upon every person possessed of competent means, to aid this Society to the best of his ability, particularly in this district, where the people were so independent and intelligent, and where the humbler classes manifested so strong a desire to be taught the sav-

ing truths of the Bible. As the chief Pastor of this extensive and important diocese, he could not refrain from saying, that an unspeakable responsibility rested on those individuals who derived their profits from the labour of the persons placed under their control; who, by the exertions of their dependents, had amassed wealth, and been elevated among their fellow-men; and who, besides the pittance they gave for their exertions, had a sacred but too much forgotten duty to perform in return, in watching over the religious principles and moral conduct of their dependents—a duty, his Lordship feared, not estimated as it ought to be, but for the neglect of which, if he understood the Gospel, and the laws of his country aright, masters were deeply responsible. By keeping a watchful eye upon their conduct—by placing in their hands moral and religious books—by the establishment of lending libraries—by these means, masters would very much contribute to the present and eternal interest of their servants; and, he would add, would likewise be contributing, in a great degree, to their own.

His Lordship said a great variety of topics pressed themselves upon his attention; but by entering upon them now, he should be led farther than he could wish. He hoped, however, that what he had advanced would have some good effect—that it would have the happiest result. But let it be borne in mind, that whatever the immediate fruits of this day's meeting might be, and he saw the most pleasing grounds for anticipating a great increase of support to the Society, still it would only be the laying of the first stone of a larger building; its erection could only be accomplished by the active personal exertions of every one who wished well to the cause. He trusted that every subscriber would solicit the support of his neighbour, and that all would co-operate with the ministers of the Established Church, to procure support to the Society. They who engaged in this labour of love would most assuredly receive their reward.

His Lordship observed, in conclusion—"Permit me to thank you for

the very kind attention you have paid to the observations I have made. If, in the course of my remarks, I should have used some expressions that may be considered too strong, I hope you will think of the great importance of my office, as spiritual Pastor of this populous district; in the discharge of the duties of which I consider myself justified in speaking on such a topic as this, with an energy and warmth, which, on another occasion, I should certainly feel some reluctance in using."

Several resolutions were then proposed by James Brierley, Esq. and seconded by Samuel Grimshaw, Esq. the Boroughreeve.

Previously to their being put to the vote, the Lord Bishop said, he ought to have stated, in the remarks he had made to the meeting, that in three instances in this diocese, within the last few weeks, he had witnessed the warmest concern for the success of the Society. In the city of Chester, his Lordship convened a meeting, which was numerously attended; and in the course of a few days, upwards of 500*l.* were subscribed. Not long afterwards, a meeting was held for the same purpose, in Warrington, where 200*l.* were subscribed in the room; and since then a meeting had been held in Liverpool, at which his Lordship presided, when a very considerable sum was subscribed forthwith.

The resolutions were then put, and unanimously carried.

On the motion of the Very Rev. the Ward-n, seconded by James Norris, Esq. the cordial thanks of the meeting were voted to the Bishop for the zeal and ability with which he had advocated the cause of the Society, and for his conduct in the chair.

In acknowledging this vote, his Lordship said—"I return you my sincere thanks for this mark of your approbation, and I trust I shall not be considered as having gone beyond the limit of my duty. Whilst I am particularly an advocate for the Established Church, I have most sincerely at heart the spiritual welfare of the Universal Church of Christ."

Prayers were again offered up by his Lordship, after which the meeting was dissolved.

STORRINGTON DISTRICT COMMITTEE,  
ESTABLISHED IN 1815.

*Report for 1824.*

PATRON.

The Right Reverend the Bishop of  
Chichester.

PRESIDENT.

The Venerable the Archdeacon of  
Chichester.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

R. Aldridge, Esq.  
E. Barker, Esq.  
E. Bligh, Esq.  
S. Bosanquet, Esq.  
J. Broadwood, Esq.  
Sir C. M. Burrell, Bart, M.P.  
W. Burrell, Esq. M.P.  
J. T. Daubuz, Esq.  
J. Eversfield, Esq.  
C. Goring, Esq.  
R. H. Hurst, Esq.  
Lieut. Gen. Sir R. Jones, K.C.B.  
J. M. Lloyd, Esq. M.P.  
T. Sanctuary, Esq.  
Sir T. Shelley, Bart.  
H. Tredcroft, Esq.  
J. Trower, Esq.  
J. Wakefield, Esq.  
R. W. Walker, Esq.

TREASURER.

The Rev. W. Woodward, West Grin-  
stead.

SECRETARIES.

The Rev. H. J. Rose, Horsham.  
The Rev. J. Penfold, Steyning.  
Rev. J. Austin, Pulborough.  
The Rev. W. Davison, Worthing.

Notwithstanding the very extensive  
issue of books by the Committee during  
several preceding years, large demands  
are still made; and it is to be expected,

*Receipts and Expenditure from Michaelmas 1823, to Michaelmas 1824.*

RECEIPTS.

	£.	s.	d.
Balance in hand at last An- nit . . . . .	19	15	3½
Subscriptions and Dona- tions received . . . . .	100	12	6
Cash for Books sold at the Reduced Price of the Committee . . . . .	118	16	1½

£239 3 11

and indeed wished, that these demands  
should continue. A rapidly increasing  
population, — the general diffusion of  
education according to the principles of  
the Established Church, — and the  
greater accommodation which has lately  
been made for attendance on Public  
Worship, in some Parishes within the  
District, are causes which severally tend  
to this effect; and, considering the cha-  
racter of the books which are issued, it  
cannot fail to afford a very pure satis-  
faction to every benevolent mind.

The Committee congratulate the  
friends of the Institution on the in-  
creasing amount of subscriptions, which  
enables them to supply every demand in  
the fullest manner; and to furnish gra-  
tuitously to the prisoners in the gaol, at  
Horsham, and to the inmates of the  
United Workhouse, at Preston, (both  
situate within the District,) and to a  
few Schools which have strong claims  
upon the Committee, such books as  
their several circumstances require.

The Committee have issued, since  
their formation in 1815, *three thousand  
seven hundred and seventy-two BIBLES  
AND TESTAMENTS*, nearly *seven thou-  
sand PRAYER BOOKS*, and *thirty-four  
thousand seven hundred other Books  
and Tracts*; and it is very encouraging  
to them in their exertions, to be assured  
that they have been the medium of im-  
parting much information and comfort  
to many grateful and pious minds.

The Committee rely with confidence  
on a continuance of the support they  
have hitherto obtained, and will endea-  
vour to administer the Funds entrusted  
to their management in such manner as  
shall be most conducive to the object of  
their appointment.

EXPENDITURE.

	£.	s.	d.
Printing Report, Notices, &c. . . . .	8	5	0
Cash to Parent Society for Books . . . . .	141	14	11
Ditto to ditto, being one third of Subscriptions and Donations . . . . .	33	10	10
Books to Prisoners in Hor- sham Gaol, and to Schools	4	8	9
Carriage of Books, Post- age, &c. . . . .	2	19	3
Allowance to Collector . .	1	0	0
Balance in the hands of the Treasurer . . . . .	47	5	2

£239 3 11

G. WELLS, Chairman.

*Bibles, Testaments, Prayer Books, Books and Tracts, distributed by the Committee, between the Audit of 1823, and the Audit of 1824.*

Bibles.....	149
Testaments.....	443
Prayer Books.....	911
Other Books and Tracts..	6124

Total..... 7627

*Bibles, Testaments, Prayer Books, &c. distributed by the Committee, since its Establishment in 1815.*

Bibles .....	1696
Testaments .....	2076
Prayer Books .....	6905
Other Books and Tracts	34782

Total.. ... 45459

In addition to the above, the Committee have sold several sets of the *Parochial Lending Library*, and of the *Society's FAMILY BIBLE*. The latter very useful book may be had in Numbers at 6d. each; and for all *poor persons* the Committee undertake to pay the expense of binding it.

## SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS\*.

### FORMATION OF A CANTERBURY DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

At a Meeting of Members of the Society for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, resident in or near Canterbury, held at the National Schools on Saturday, Nov. 13th, 1824.

The Hon. & Ven. ARCHDEACON PERCY in the Chair.

The following Resolutions were adopted:—

1st—That a Committee be formed, to be called the Canterbury Diocesan Committee of the Society for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

2nd—That all Members of the Parent Society resident within the Diocese, and also all Subscribers to the amount of 10s. annually, be considered Members of the Committee.

3rd—That the smallest Donations or Subscriptions be received, and that the Members of the Committee be request-

ed to collect the same in their respective neighbourhoods, and to promote the interests of the Society to the utmost of their power.

4th—That his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to accept the Title of Patron of the Committee.

5th—That the Honorable and Venerable Archdeacon PERCY be requested to accept the Office of President of the Committee.

6th—That the Honorable and Reverend G. PELLEW, and the Reverend JAMES HAMILTON, be appointed joint Secretaries and Treasurers of the Committee.

7th—That the Committee do meet once in every year, and at other times, whenever the President may deem it expedient.

8th—That all Subscriptions be considered as becoming due on the First of

\* We would call attention to the following notices affixed to the last Report of the Society.

Rev. Anthony Hamilton, M.A. 42, Castle-street, Leicester-square, is their Secretary, to whom all letters on the Society's business are to be directed.

Rev. H. B. Wilson, D.D. 12, Carlton Chambers, Regent-street, is their Assistant Secretary and Receiver, to whom all remittances are to be made, and communications addressed, relative to the accounts of the Diocesan and District Committees.

James Haywood Markland, Esq. Temple, is their Treasurer, to whom all Legacies are to be paid.

Mr. John Doggett, 11, Shouldham-street, Bryanstone-square, is their Messenger and Collector.

January in every year, and be received by the Secretaries, or at either of the Canterbury Banks.

9th—That the thanks of this Meeting be given to the Hon. and Ven. Archdeacon PERCY for his able conduct in the Chair.

GEORGE PELLEW, } Secretaries.  
JAMES HAMILTON, }

[Correspondence with the Committee may be addressed to the Hon. and Rev. G. PELLEW, Cathedral Precincts, Canterbury.]

### PRESENT MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE.

*His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, Patron.*

Date of Admission.		Annual Subscription.		
		£.	s.	d.
1805	Andrewes, G. D.D. <i>Dean of Canterbury</i> (Incorporated)....	2	2	0
1823	Barlow, Rev. Wm. <i>Vicar of St. Mary Evedin</i> .....	1	1	0
1824	Bennett, Rev. Wm. <i>Rector of St. George's</i> .....	1	1	0
	Brown, Rev. Walter, <i>Prebendary of Canterbury</i> .....	2	2	0
	Bunce, Rev. J. B. <i>Vicar of St. Dunstan's</i> .....	1	1	0
	Carter, Dr. M.D. <i>Canterbury</i> .....	1	1	0
	Clarke, Anthony, Esq. <i>Canterbury</i> .....	1	1	0
	Croft, Rev. James, <i>Prebendary of Canterbury</i> .....	2	2	0
	Dashwood, Thomas, Esq. <i>Canterbury</i> .....	1	1	0
	Dickins, Rev. W. W. <i>Rector of Addisham</i> .....	1	1	0
	Eden, Hon. and Rev. Wm. <i>Vicar of Beakshourn</i> .....	1	1	0
	Fagg, Sir John, Bart. <i>Mystole</i> .....	1	1	0
	Fielding, Rev. Henry, <i>St. Stephen's</i> .....	1	1	0
	Fielding, Rev. Charles, <i>St. Margaret's</i> .....	1	1	0
	Fieldings, the Miss.....	1	1	0
1817	Gipps, George, Esq. <i>Howletts</i> , (Incorporated).....	1	1	0
1823	Gregory, Rev. Edw. <i>Lower Hardres</i> .....	1	1	0
1824	Hallett, Rev. C. Hughes, <i>Higham</i> .....	1	1	0
1823	Hamilton, Rev. J. R. <i>St. Stephen's, Secretary &amp; Treasurer</i>	1	1	0
1824	Hutchinson, Rev. Mr.....	1	1	0
1818	Marlow, Rev. Dr. <i>Preb. of Canterbury</i> , (Incorporated)..	2	2	0
1824	Marriot, G. P. <i>Minor Canon of Canterbury</i> .....	1	1	0
	May, George, Esq. <i>Herne</i> .....	1	1	0
	Metcalf, Rev. J. <i>Minor Canon of Canterbury</i> .....	0	10	6
	Moody, Rev. H. R. <i>Rector of Charlham</i> .....	1	1	0
1796	Moore, Rev. G. <i>Prebendary of Canterbury</i> , (Incorporated)	2	2	0
1821	Moore, Rev. Robert, <i>Do</i> .....	2	2	0
	Mutlow, Rev. T. A. <i>Rector of St. Martin's</i> .....	1	1	0
	Parker, D. J. Esq. <i>Canterbury</i> .....	1	1	0
1818	Pellow, Hon. and Rev. G. <i>Prebendary of Canterbury, Secretary and Treasurer</i> , (Incorporated).....	2	2	0
1824	Pellow, Hon. Mrs. G. ....	1	1	0
1820	Percy, Hon. & Ven. Archdeacon, <i>President</i> , (Incorporated)	2	2	0
1824	Plumptre, Rev. Henry, <i>St. Stephen's</i> .....	1	1	0
	Ramsay, General, <i>Whitefriars</i> .....	1	1	0
	Smyth, Rev. Edward, <i>Bourn House</i> .....	2	2	0
	Simons, Rev. N. <i>Rector of Ickham</i> .....	1	1	0
	Starr, Thomas, Esq. <i>Precincts</i> .....	1	1	0
	Tillard, James, Esq. <i>Street End</i> .....	2	2	0
	Webb, Colonel, <i>Harbledown</i> .....	1	1	0

#### DONATIONS.

A Lady, (by Mr. Pellow).....	1	0	0
J. Dilnott, Esq. ....	1	1	0
Mrs. Hutchinson, <i>Precincts</i> .....	1	1	0
James Tillard, Esq. (for building Churches in Canada).....	50	0	0



## UNIVERSITY AND CLERICAL INTELLIGENCE.

## OXFORD.

*Degrees conferred, January 14.*

## MASTERS OF ARTS.

Alington, John, and  
 Edwards, James, Magdalen College.  
 Germon, Nicholas, Oriel College.  
 Goodday, John William, Queen's College.  
 Harrison, William, Christ Church.  
 Hett, William Kaye, Lincoln College.  
 Holberton, Robert, Exeter College.  
 Horne, Thomas, Christ Church.  
 Linton, James, and  
 Meredith, Charles John, Magdalen College.

## BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Browne, Henry, Lincoln College.  
 Chinn, Henry Barrow, Brasenose College.  
 Farwell, Arthur, Exeter College.  
 Hussey, Robert, Christ Church.  
 Latham, Richard, Brasenose College.  
 Masters, John Smalman, Jesus College.  
 Woodhouse, George Windus, St. Mary Hall.

*December 24.*

The following gentlemen were admitted Students of Christ Church: — Douglas Smith, Walter Lucas Brown, Henry Sanders, John George Phillimore, and William Pitt Amherst, from Westminster. William Pye, John Christopher Dowdswell, Robert French Laurence, Edward John Wingfield, Frederick Calvert, the Hon. Charles Bathurst, and Richard Seymour, Commoners.

*January 15.*

John Mitchell Chapman, B.A. of Exeter College, was elected Fellow of Balliol College.

## CAMBRIDGE.

*Degree conferred, January 11.*

## MASTER OF ARTS.

Judge, Edward, Esq. by Royal Mandate.

## BACHELORS' COMMENCEMENT.

*January 22, 1825.*

WRANGLERS.		Smith,	Pet.	Malkin,	Trin.	Reade,	Cai.
		Heathfield,	Jes.	Hill,	Trin.	Wayne,	Pet.
Challis,	Trin.	Maude,	Cai.	Crooker,	Trin.	Skimmer,	Sid.
Williamson,	Clare	Martin,	Cai.	Warner,	Trin.		
Newton,	Joh.	Riddell,	Trin.	Yong,	Trin.		
Ranken,	C.C.	Barlow,	Pet.	Holme,	Cai.	JUNIOR OPTIMES.	
Waud,	Mag.	Dunningham,	Pet.	C. Morton,	Trin.	Lewis,	Joh.
P. Morton,	Trin.	Richardson,	Cai.	Prater,	Trin.	Bollaerts,	Trin.
Parker,	Trin.			Hawkins,	Trin.	Qu.	Hildyard,
Wigram,	Trin.			Bell,	Æq.	C.C.	Willmore,
Williamson,	Trin.	SENIOR OPTIMES.		Ward,	Æq.	Joh.	Evans,
Burrows,	Cai.	Labbock,	Trin.	Ayerst,	Joh.	Outram,	Joh.
Darby,	Joh.	Pooley,	Joh.	Earle,	Joh.	Brooke,	Cai.
Frampton,	Joh.	Isaacson,	Joh.	Hayes,	Joh.	Wakefield,	Joh.
Blakebeck,	Cath.	Warner,	Joh.	Custance,	Trin.	Fletcher,	Mag.
Dade,	Cai.	Berkeley,	Chr.	Smith,	Trin.	Falcon,	Joh.
Cape,	Cai.	Langham,	Joh.	Turner,	Joh.	Marshall,	Joh.
Beatson,	Pem.	Phillips,	Chr.	Gaitskell,	Trin.	Sanderson,	Joh.
Wilson,	Joh.	Gaye,	Joh.	Youldon,	Joh.	Præd,	Trin.
Harriam,	Joh.	Wolfe,	Clare	Barry,	Trin.	Dallin,	C.C.
Ferne,	Cai.	Farish,	Trin.	Lowe,	Chr.	Wimberley,	Emm.
Barrick,	Qu.	Gilpin,	Æq.	Kempthorne,	Joh.		
Graham,	Qu.	Smith,	Pem.				
Knowles,	Trin.						

VOL. VII. NO. II.

R

Calthrop, C.C.		ÆGROTAT.		Richmond, Cai.		Chilcott, Joh.	
Autrobus, Joh.		Dighton, Joh.		Hudson, Pet.		Wickenden, Joh.	
Cross, How.		Goode, Trin.		Kynnersley, Trin.		Wilson, Cath.	
Cromptley, Trin.							
Pickering, Joh.	Lewis, Clare	Storie, Clare	Hopwood, Trin.				
Metcalf, Joh.	Warren, Sid.	Knight, Trin.	Blake, Trin.				
Nicholls, Qu.	Jordan, Joh.	Oakes, } Æq. Jes.	Luke, Jes.				
Nairne, Trin.	O'Brien, Trin.	Sharpe, } Emm.	Bradford, C.C.				
Davidson, Qu.	Hartshorne, Joh.	Morley, } Pet.	Stuart, Chr.				
Bonney, Clare	Hastwick, Qu.	Rich, } Æq. Cai.	Hargreaves, Pem.				
Burton, Clare	Cookson, sen. Trin.	Parmeter, C.C.	White, Qu.				
Furlong, Qu.	Cox, Trin.	Streitfield, Chr.	Griffith, Qu.				
Luck, Cath.	Veel, Chr.	Scholesfield, C.C.	Stevenson, Trin.				
Cleveland, Joh.	Marriott, Mag.	Sharpe, Qu.	Neale, Trin.				
Wollaston, Trin. H.	Daniell, Trin.	Clarkson, Trin.	Forester, Jes.				
Perring, Pem.	Half head, Qu.	Allwood, Cai.	Pinfold, Chr.				
Decker, Trin.	Bland, } Æq. Trin.	Williams, Trin.	Whitaker, Joh.				
Holdship, Jes.	Hammond, } Qu.	Jones, Mag.	Lewin, Trin.				
Healy, Cai.	Senhouse, Pem.	Sharland, } Æq. Jes.	Willan, Joh.				
Goodwin, Jes.	Chenery, Jes.	Speke, } Æq. Emm.	Fenwick, C.C.				
King, Cath.	Buck, Cai.	White, Down.	Allen, Trin.				
Edison, Chr.	Gibson, } Æq. Cath.	Schomberg, } Æq. Em.	Ellis, Trin.				
Cookson, jun. Trin.	Hitch, } Æq. Pem.	Smith, } Æq. Joh.	Cobb, Chr.				
Roberts, Qu.	Tiptaft, Joh.	Stone, Pet.	Allen, Pem.				
Quekett, Joh.	Elphinstone, } Æq. Trin.	Dawson, } Æq. Cat.	Clark, Trin.				
Marshall, C.C.	Long, jun. } Æq. Trin.	Dayrell, } Æq. Ma.	Hoake, Jes.				
Cavie, Joh.	Richardson, Trin.	De Burgh, Joh.	Bower, Trin.				
Wheatley, Trin.	Luxmoore, jun. Pem.	Yates, C.C.	Rendle, Jes.				
Beales, Trin.	Campbell, Jes.	Sicklemore, Trin.	Williamson, Qu.				
Hopper, Joh.	Burnaby, Emm.	Forbes, } Æq. Trin.	Osborne, Trin. H.				
Johnson, Chr.	Schomberg, C.C.	Smith, } Æq. Trin.	Ryland, Joh.				
Byde, Pem.	Fowler, } Æq. Jes.	Wright, Trin.	Maine, Trin.				
Simpson, Mag.	James, } Æq. Trin.	Jesson, Joh.	Johnstone, Trin.				
Coldham, Cai.	Oxenden, Chr.	Kerr, Joh.	Hankin, Pem.				
Norris, Cai.	Bras, Joh.	Long, sen. Trin.	Smith, Chr.				
Ainslie, Emm.	Macleod, Trin.	Ombler, } Æq. Trin.	Tomblin, Emm.				
Gorst, Joh.	Ford, } Æq. Trin.	Roberts, } Æq. Trin.	Place, Clare				
Kennion, Chr.	Yates, } Æq. Trin.	Jarrett, Joh.	Sneyd, Trin.				
Day, Cai.	Bally, Down.	Monkhouse, Joh.	Blanchard, Jes.				
Norton, Jes.	Donald, Joh.	Minchin, Trin.	Wyattville, Sid.				
Barne, Sid.	Bartlett, Joh.	Ord, Trin.	Peshall, Pet.				
Walford, C.C.	Jones, Qu.	Williams, Pet.	Crews, Trin.				
Brown, Chr.	Wintour, Mag.	Nunn, Sid.	White, Trin. H.				
Jeckell, C.C.	Alpe, C.C.	Chevallier, Pem.	Townsend, Trin.				
E. Davies, Trin.	Baddeley, } Æq. Trin.	Feilden, Mag.	Colquhoun, Trin.				
Helps, Trin.	Gibbons, Sid.	Humfrey, Pet.					
Tolpatt, Sid.	Shutt, } Æq. Trin.	Browne, Sid.	H. Davis, Trin.				
Matland, Trin.	Williams, } Æq. Trin.	Bayley, Joh.	Deedes, Trin.				
Lister, Joh.	Newport, Chr.	Armstrong, } Æq. Trin.	More, Chr.				
Wynyard, Chr.	Maude, Emm.	Lambert, } Æq. Trin.	Parr, Trin.				
Williamson, Joh.	Raspini, Clare	Hammill, Trin.	Thorpe, Pem.				
Dickens, Jes.	Tuffnell, Emm.	Money Penny, Clare	Tighe, Trin.				
Dyson, Jes.	Crowther, Clare	Smith, Marriott, Trin.					

The prize for the Hulsean dissertation for the year 1824, is adjudged to James Amiraux Jeremie, *B.A.* Scholar of Trinity College. Subject—"The Doctrines of our Saviour, as derived from the four Gospels, are in perfect harmony with the Doctrines of St. Paul, as derived from his Epistles."

The Master and Fellows of Peterhouse have recently augmented the patronage of their College, by founding two Fellowships and four Scholarships, the stipends of which are to be paid from the proceeds of the very liberal donation of the Rev. Francis Gisborne, *M.A.* formerly Fellow of

that Society. The Fellows and Scholars on the foundation are to bear the name of the donor.

January 14.

The Rev. John W. Hubbersty, *M.A.* and the Rev. John Sandys, *B.A.* of Queen's College, were elected Fellows of that Society; and at the same time a petition was ordered to be presented to the King, for a dispensation to qualify the Rev. Thomas Clowes, *B.A.* to hold a fellowship of the same Society.

There will be congregations on the following days of the Lent Term:—Wednesday, Feb. 9, at eleven; Wednesday, Feb. 23, at eleven; Wednesday, March 2, at eleven; Friday, March 18, (*M.A.* Incceptors), at ten; Friday, March 25 (end of term), at ten.

The following is the subject of the Hulsean Prize dissertation for the present year:—"In what respects the Law is a Schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ."

Sir William Browne's Gold Medals.—The subjects for the present year are—

FOR THE GREEK ODE.

Ἀνδρῶν ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος.

LATIN ODE.

*Academia Cantabrigiensis tot novis ædificiis ornata.*

GREEK EPIGRAM.

Περὶ σοὶ πάντες οἱ ν' μίση λόγον.

LATIN EPIGRAM.

*Suummum jus, summa injuria.*

FORSON PRIZE.

The passage fixed upon for the present year is—

SHAKESPEARE, King John, *Act IV. Scene 2*, beginning with

KING JOHN—"How oft the sight of Means,"

and ending with

HUBERT.—"an innocent child."

In conformity with the regulations passed by the Senate, March 13, 1822, notice has been given that the following will be the subjects of examination in the last week of the Lent Term, 1826:—

1. The Gospel of St. Matthew.
2. Paley's Evidences of Christianity.
3. The First Book of Herodotus.
4. The Fourth Book of Virgil's *Georgics*.

# ORDINATIONS.

December 19.

By the Bishop of London, at a General Ordination.

## DEACONS.

Chaplyn, James Robert, *M.A.* Trinity College, Oxford.  
Cockran, William, Literate.  
Doran, John William, *B.A.* Trinity College, Dublin.  
Mello, Matthew Roque de, *LL.B.* Jesus College, Cambridge.  
Musgrave, Christopher John, *M.A.* St. Alban Hall, Oxford.  
Ramsden, William, *B.A.* Christ College;  
Small, Alexander Henry, *B.A.* Emmanuel College;  
Wade, William Serocold, *B.A.* St. John's College, and  
Watson, Joseph Burges, *B.A.* Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

## PRIESTS.

Adams, William, *M.A.* Trinity College, Oxford.  
Beevor, William Smythies, *B.A.* Jesus College, Cambridge.  
Bosanquet, Robert William, *B.A.* Balliol College, Oxford.  
Caunter, Richard McDonald, *S.C.L.* Sidney Sussex College;  
Clay, William Keatinge, Jesus College;  
Cutbush, Charles, *B.A.* St. John's College;  
Earle, James Henry, *S.C.L.* Jesus College;  
Evans, David, *B.A.* St. Peter's College; and  
Lewis, Edward Page, *B.A.* Caius College; Cambridge.  
Mayo, Richard, *B.A.* St. John's College, Oxford.  
Parker, William Harris, *B.A.* Downing College;  
Tanner, John Lyncham, *B.A.* St. John's College; and  
Wallace, Arthur Capel Job, *B.A.* Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.  
Williams, William, Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

By the Lord Bishop of Bangor, in the Parish Church of Llandegai, Carnarvonshire.

## DEACONS.

Goddard, William, *B.A.* Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.  
Lloyd, Evan, *B.A.* Jesus College, Cambridge.  
Mealy, R. R. Parry, *B.A.* St. John's College, and  
Richards, Henry, *B.A.* and

Williams, Edmund, *B.A.* Jesus College, Oxford.

## PRIESTS.

Hughes, Howel, *B.A.* Jesus College, Oxford.

Owen, Thomas Lloyd, *B.A.* Jesus College, Cambridge.

Pughe, John, *B.A.* Jesus College, Oxford.

Williams, Bulkeley, St. Peter's College, Cambridge, and

Wynne, Hugh Hughes, Jesus College, Oxford.

By the Lord Bishop of Salisbury, at his Palace.

## DEACONS.

Ward, John, *B.A.* Christ College, and Williams, Thomas, *B.A.* St. John's College, Cambridge.

## PRIEST.

Dickenson, Wm. Henry, *S.C.L.* Chr. Coll.

By the Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry.

## DEACONS.

Bagnall, Henry, *B.A.* Queen's College, and Kempson, Edward, *B.A.* Trinity College, Cambridge.

## January 2.

By the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, in the Cathedral Church of Wells.

## DEACONS.

Bower, Edward, *B.A.* Jesus College, Cambridge.

Daubeney, James, *B.A.* Brasenose College, Oxford.

Dunn, William, *B.A.* and

Garton, Joseph, *B.A.* Queen's College, and

Harvey, Thomas, *B.A.* Christ College, Cambridge, and

Potticary, George Brown Francis, *B.A.* Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

## PRIESTS.

Ragshawe, Edw. Benjamin, *B.A.* Magdalen College;

Bere, William Baker, *B.A.* Emmanuel College;

Cosens, Edward Hyde, *B.A.* Catherine Hall;

Dakins, John Horsley, *S.C.L.* Trinity College, Cambridge.

Graham, William, *M.A.* Christ Church; and

Stone, David Smith, *B.A.* Exeter College, Oxford.

Waterfield, Richard, *M.A.* Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

West, John, *M.A.* Exeter College, and Woodhouse, George Windus, St. Mary Hall, Oxford.

By the Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, in the Cathedral of Lichfield.

## DEACONS.

Curzon, Hon. A. and

Chinn, H. Brasenose College.

Cragg, S. Magdalen Hall.

Floyer, C. *B.A.* and

Hassel, C. S. *B.A.* Trinity College.

Hatherell, J. W. *B.A.* St. Alban Hall.

Teasdale, T. W. *B.A.* Lincoln College, and

Wylde, T. *B.A.* Christ Church, Oxford.

## PRIESTS.

Brown, Rev. T. Powell, *B.A.* and

Wakefield, Rev. J. *B.A.* St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

By the Lord Bishop of Worcester, in the Chapel at Hartlebury Castle.

## DEACONS.

Carles, Charles Edward, *B.A.* Catherine Hall, Cambridge.

Macdonald, Jacob, *S.C.L.* Magdalen Hall, and

Smithwick, William John, *M.A.* Oriel College, Oxford.

## PRIESTS.

Amphlett, Joseph, *B.A.* Trinity College; and

Parker, Charles Hubert, *B.A.* and

Price, Thomas, *B.A.* Wadham College, Oxford.

## PREFERMENTS.

Baker, L. P. *B.A.* Vicar of Impington and Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Rectory of Merbourne cum Holt, in the County of Leicester; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

Boudier, John, Chaplain to the Earl of Warwick, to the Rectory of Farmington, Gloucestershire, and to hold the same with the Vicarage of St. Mary's, Warwick, by Dispensation, Patron, H. E. Waller, Esq. of Hall Barn, Buckinghamshire.

Blayds, Henry, *M.A.* to the Perpetual Curacy of Charterhouse Hinton.

Clarke, William, *M.A.* Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor of Anatomy, to the Vicarage of Wymeswold, Leicestershire; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

Crawley, E. J. of Bath, to be one of the Chaplains to his Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence.

Davies, G. J. of Hull, to the Perpetual Curacy of Marfield in Holderness; Patron, H. Grill, Esq.

Follet, R. F. to the Mastership of Taunton College School; Patron, the Warden of New College, Oxford.

Fornaby, Miles, *M.A.* of Brasenose College, Oxford, to the Perpetual Curacy of Cotelstone.

Gatehouse, Thomas, *B.A.* to the Rectory of North Cheriton.

Gathorne, John, to the Vicarage of Tavin, Cheshire.

Godfrey, T. to the Rectory of Newbourn, Suffolk; Patron, Sir William Rowley, Bart.

Greene, William, late Dean of Achonry, to the Rectory of Aboghill, in the Diocese of Connor.

Haggitt, G. *M.A.* Fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Soham, Cambridgeshire; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of Pembroke Hall.

Harkness, Robert, *B.A.* to the Vicarage of Stowey, Somersetshire.

Haythorne, Joseph, *M.A.* of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Congresbury, with the Chapel of Weck St. Lawrence, annexed.

Hopkins, Adolphus, *B.A.* to the Vicarage of Clent, with the Chapel of Rowley Regis annexed, in the county of Stafford, and Diocese of Worcester; Patron, the King.

Irving, Matthew, *B.D.* Vicar of Sturminster Marshall, Dorset, and Prebendary of Rochester, to be Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty.

Jackson, Jeremiah, *M.A.* Vicar of Swaffham Bulbeck, and Domestic Chaplain to Lord Macdonald, to hold the Vicarage of Elm cum Eyneth, Cambridgeshire, together with the Vicarage of Swaffham Bulbeck, by Dispensation.

Jackson, John, *M.A.* of Queen's College, Oxford, to be Head Master of the Free Grammar School of Northleach, in the county of Gloucester; Patrons, the Provost and Fellows of that Society.

Keane, John Epey, late officiating Chaplain to the Garrison at Dublin, to be Chaplain to the Colony of New South Wales and its Dependencies; Patron, the Earl of Bathurst.

Madan, Rev. Spencer, *M.A.* Canon Residentiary of Lichfield, to be Domestic Chaplain to the Earl Mann-Cornwallis.

Michell, Bennett, *M.A.* to the Vicarage of Winsford; Patrons, the Master, Fellows and Scholars of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Naylor, T. *B.A.* of St. John's College, Cambridge, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

Pahner, G. to the Rectory of Parham, Sussex.

Perkins, Benjamin Robert, *B.A.* of Lincoln College, Oxford, to a Chaplaincy

in Christ Church; Patron, the Very Rev. the Dean of that Cathedral.

Prince, J. C. *M.A.* of Brasenose College, Oxford, to the Perpetual Curacy of St. Thomas, Liverpool; Patrons, the Mayor and Corporation.

Quicke, Andrew, *M.A.* Fellow of New College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Newton St. Cyres, Devon.

Quicke, William Henry, *B.A.* to the Rectory of Ashbrittle.

Robson, R. S. to the Perpetual Curacy of Rancilffe, Yorkshire, Patron, Major Yarbrough, of Neslington Lodge.

Royle, J. *M.A.* to the Rectory of Stanfield, Norfolk; Patron, the Rev. William Newcome, of Hockwold Hall.

Sandford, John, *B.A.* of Balliol College, and Curate of Wells, to be Chaplain to the Marquis of Queensbury.

Simmons, Charles Tynte, *B.A.* to the Rectory of East Lambrook.

Smith, H. R. Somers, *B.A.* of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Rectory of Little Bentley, Essex; Patron, Robert Foote, Esq.

Smith, Jeremiah, *D.D.* of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Master of Manchester School, to be one of the King's four Preachers in Lancashire.

Stone, David Smith, *B.A.* to the Perpetual and augmented Curacy of Wilton.

Trevelyan, John Thomas, of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Milverton Prima, with the Chapelry of Langford Badville annexed; Patron, the Ven. George Trevelyan, *LL.B.* Archdeacon of Taunton.

Wharton, Rev. T. to St. John's Wood Chapel, St. Mary-la-bonne; Patron, the King.

Wood, George, *M.A.* Rector of Cum St. Rumbold, and Chaplain to the County Gaol, to the Rectory of the Holy Trinity, Dorchester; Patron, the Corporation of Dorchester.

#### CLERGYMEN MARRIED.

Boyd, James, Minister of the Parish of Auchinleck, in the county of Ayr, to Jane, only sister of A. K. Hutchison, Esq. Solicitor, of Crown Court; at St. Martin's Outwich, London.

Brockman, Tatton, to Louisa, youngest daughter of Sir Henry Hawley, Bart.

Champnes, Thomas W. Rector of Fulmer, Bucks, and Cottisford, Oxon, to Miss Langford, of Eton College.

Cribin, J. Bowen, Curate of Llanelly, &c. Brecon, to Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Mr. Enoch Davies, of Crigwell, near Lampeter; at Llanwenog, Cardiganshire.

Chudleigh, Stawell, to Mary, widow of

- the late James Palmer Hobbs, Esq. of Mount Ephraim, Tunbridge Wells; at Cardington, Bedfordshire.
- Davies, Matthew, *M.A.* of Hinstock, Salop, to Hannah, daughter of Mr. J. Linwood, St. Paul's-square; at Birmingham.
- Dawson, George, *B.A.* of Fennagh Lodge, to Ellen, youngest daughter of Dudley Hill, Esq.
- Donne, James, *M.A.* Vicar of St. Paul's, Bedford, and Perpetual Curate of South Carlton, Lincolnshire, to Mary, eldest daughter of the late Matthew Dobson, Esq.; January 8, at Kirk Ellen.
- Fowler, Thomas Hodgson, of Southwell, Nottinghamshire, to Frances Elizabeth, only child of Thomas Bish, Esq.; at St. Mary, Lambeth.
- Gordon, Robert, Rector of Seampton, Cambridgeshire, to Barbara, daughter of the Rev. W. Ellis, of Branston, near Lincoln.
- Gorman, ——— to Harriett, fourth daughter of Sir Jonas Greene, Recorder of Dublin.
- Guest, W. B. to Miss Ann Stelfox.
- Holding, John, *M.A.* of St. John's College, Oxford, and of Oakeley, Hants, to Susannah, daughter of the late Robert Lovegrove, Esq. of Wallingford.
- Jones, John Collier, *B.D.* Rector of Exeter College, Oxford, to Charlotte, daughter of the late Rev. Duke Yonge, of Cornwood, and widow of Captain G. Crawley, N.N.; at Plympton, Devon.
- Jones, Morgan, to Emmeline, second daughter of W. Wood, Esq. of the Whitehouse, Herefordshire; at Vow Church.
- Kirkby, J. to Miss Nancy Fayrer.
- Manwaring, Roger, *M.A.* of Brasenose College, Oxford, Chaplain to the Earl of Huntingdon, and youngest son of John Robert Parker, Esq. of Green Park, in the county of Cork, and of Kirmincham Hall, in the County Palatine of Chester, to Philadelphia Sarah, daughter of Benjamin Bladen, Esq. of Bledlow House, and niece to Sir Robert Cayley, of Brompton, in the county of York, Bart.; at Bledlow, Bucks.
- Mills, John, to Caroline, second daughter of Mr. W. Corbett; at Church Lench, Worcestershire.
- M'Gregor, S. to Mary, second daughter of James Leslie, Esq.; at Leith Walk.
- Mitchinson, T. to Miss Clarke; at Boston.
- Morgan, Henry, to Emma, eldest daughter of Henry Scott, Esq. of Beslow Hall, Salop.
- Noel, the Hon. and Rev. Leland, Vicar of Campden, Gloucestershire, seventh son of Sir Gerard Noel, Bart. and the late Baroness Barham, to Mary Arabella, eldest daughter of the late John Seville Foljambe, Esq. of Aldwark Hall, Yorkshire; at Worksop, by the Rev. Archdeacon Eyre.
- Powell, J. T. Rector of Llanhamlach and Cantref, Breconshire, to Arabella, daughter of the late E. C. Ives, Esq. of Tichfield, Hants.
- Robinson, Edmund, *M.A.* of Balliol College, to Lydia, youngest daughter of the Rev. Thomas Gisborne, *M.A.* of Yoxall Lodge, Yorkshire, and Prebendary of Durham; Dec. 20, at Yoxall.
- Robinson, M. *B.A.* of Market Rasen, to Caroline, only daughter of the late J. W. Davis, Esq. of Boston.
- Scargill, Wm. Pitt, of Bury, to Mary Anne, second daughter of Mr. Robert Cutting, late of Chevington, Norfolk.
- Short, John, to Ann, fourth daughter of the late Colonel Mercier, of Portarlington; at Dublin.
- Spilsbury, F. W. of Willington, Derbyshire, to Emma Penelope, daughter of A. Mosley, Esq. and Lady Every, of Park Hill.
- Starkey, Samuel, to Anne, daughter of the late R. Hooper, Esq. of Cheltenham; at Wootton Bassett, Wilts.
- Stebbing, Henry, to Miss Griffin, of Norwich.
- Story, John Bridges, *M.A.* Vicar of Great Tey, Essex, to Martha, eldest daughter of the Rev. Dr. Romaine, Castle Hill Lodge, Reading, Berks; at Kelvedon, by the Rev. Ambrose Serle, Rector of Kelvedon Hatch.
- Taylor, J. J. of Manchester, to Hannah, eldest daughter of T. Smith, Esq. of Icknield House; at Birmingham.
- Timbrill, Dr. of Worcester College, Oxford, and of Beckford, Gloucestershire, to Miss E. Edwards, of Bath.
- Triphook, John, to Maria, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Joseph Wright, Vicar of the Union of Agah-down, Kilcoo, and Cape Clear; at Creagh Church, Ireland.
- Wharton, C. Curate of Great Whitley, to Mary Ann, daughter of the late Mr. J. Crane, of Bewdley; at Mitton Chapel, Stourport.
- Wilson, Edward Carus, *B.A.* third son of William Wilson Carus Wilson, Esq. M.P. of Casterton Hall, Westmoreland, to Jane, only daughter of Thomas Maude, Esq. of Woodlands, near Harrowgate; at Knaresborough.
- Wills, W. Vicar of Holcombe Regis, Devon, to Judith, second daughter of H. Wilson, Esq. of the same place.



CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

Baldwin, N. R. Vicar of Leyland, Lancashire, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and one of the King's Preachers.  
 Blakeney, Robert, *B.C.L.* of Great Elm, Somersetshire.  
 Carpenter, Jas. Rector of Burwash, Kent.  
 Cumming, William Collins, *M.A.* Rector of St. Mary's, and Vicar of Eaton Bray, Bedfordshire; he was formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, *B.A.* 1784, *M.A.* 1787. The Vicarage of Eaton Bray is in the Patronage of the Master and Fellows of that Society.  
 Clark, W. Alfred, *M.A.* Rector of Castle Camps, Cambridgeshire, late Preacher at the Charter House, and formerly Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. The Rectory is in the Patronage of the Governors of the Charter House.  
 Davis, Thomas, for many years Rector of Trevilan, and Vicar of Llanvihangel Ystrad, Cardiganshire; at Bwlch, aged 67.  
 Decker, Thomas, *M.A.* Vicar of Bawdsey, Suffolk, Rector of St. Simon and St. Jude, Perpetual Curate of St. Margaret and St. Swithin, in Norwich, and Chaplain to the County Gaol; at Norwich, aged 66.  
 Dowland, James, Rector of Winterborne Clenstone, near Blandford, Dorset, and one of the Magistrates for that county, aged 73.  
 Feild, James, *M.A.* of Queen's College, Oxford, at Powick Vicarage, in the 29th year of his age.  
 Fisher, Henry, *M.A.* 28 years Vicar of Soham, Cambridgeshire, and formerly

Fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, *B.A.* 1772, *M.A.* 1775. The living is in the Patronage of the Master and Fellows of that Society, aged 77.  
 Gartham, Thomas, Master of the Grammar School, Skipton, Yorkshire.  
 Hickee, P. T. at Ardingley Rectory, aged 28.  
 Holgate, J. at his father's house, Settle, Yorkshire.  
 Molony, W. Rector of Dunleckney, county of Carlow.  
 Morrison, T. H. Vicar of Launcells, Cornwall, and a Magistrate for Devon.  
 Noyes, —, Curate of Chale, Isle of Wight.  
 Parsons, J. Weddell, upwards of 40 years Vicar of Wellington, and Perpetual Curate of Marston and Pencoyd, Herefordshire.  
 Parsons, Rev. William, Vicar of Marden, Herefordshire; at Newton Cottage.  
 Pochin, W. Rector of Morcott, Rutland, in the 75th year of his age.  
 Richman, H. J. Rector of Holy Trinity, Dorchester, Dorset; suddenly killed, at an advanced age, by the falling of the roof of his house on him while asleep in bed, during the late storm.  
 Stocking, William, eldest son of the Rev. William Reader, of St. James's, Bury.  
 Tatham, Ralph, formerly of St. John's College, Cambridge, and father of the Public Orator of that University; at Bishopton, Durham.  
 Toghill, Moses, *M.A.* Canon Residentiary and Precentor of Chichester Cathedral; at Chichester, in his 81st year.  
 Walker, T. Vicar of East Hoathly, Sussex; aged 63.

A GENERAL BILL OF ALL THE CHRISTENINGS AND BURIALS

WITHIN THE CITY OF LONDON AND BILLS OF MORTALITY,  
 FROM DEC. 17, 1823, TO DEC. 14, 1824.

Christened in the 97 parishes within the walls, 909; buried, 1,127. Christened in the 17 parishes without the walls, 5,176; buried, 3,917. Christened in the 24 out-parishes in Middlesex and Surry, 15,132; buried, 10,667. Christened in the 10 parishes in the city and liberties of Westminster, 4,641; buried, 4,526.

Christened	{ Males.....	12,978	} In all 25,753
	{ Females.....	12,780	
Buried ....	{ Males.....	10,565	} In all 20,257
	{ Females.....	9,672	

Whereof have died,

Under Two Years of Age .....	6,476	Fifty and Sixty .....	1,742
Between Two and Five .....	2,103	Sixty and Seventy .....	1,715
Five and Ten .....	798	Seventy and Eighty .....	1,411
Ten and Twenty .....	764	Eighty and Ninety .....	593
Twenty and Thirty .....	1,296	Ninety and a Hundred .....	84
Thirty and Forty .....	1,444	A Hundred and Three .....	1
Forty and Fifty .....	1,809	A Hundred and Seven .....	1

Decreased in the burials this year, 350.

## MONTHLY LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

Sermons, Parochial and Domestic.  
By the Rev. R. S. Barton, Vicar of  
Alconbury, Hunts. 12mo. 4s.

Five Discourses on the Personal  
Office of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost;  
on the Doctrine of the Trinity; on  
Faith and on Regeneration; with an  
Appendix. By the Rev. W. Procter,  
Jun. M.A. Fellow of Catherine Hall,  
Cambridge, and Lecturer of Berwick.  
Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. bds.

Hele's Select Offices of Private Devo-  
tion; viz. 1. Office of Daily Devo-  
tion; with a Supplement—2. Office for  
the Lord's Day—3. Office of Peni-  
tence and Humiliation—4. Office for  
the Holy Communion. With large  
Collections out of the Holy Scriptures.

New Edition, revised and enlarged.  
8vo. 10s. 6d.

An Essay on the Absolving Power  
of the Church; with especial reference  
to the offices of the Church of Eng-  
land for the ordering of Priests and  
the Visitation of the Sick. With cop-  
ious Illustrations and Notes. By the  
Rev. T. H. Lowe, M.A. Vicar of  
Grimley, Worcester, and Chaplain to  
the Rt. Hon. Viscount Gage. 8vo.  
2s. 6d.

A Reply to the Second Postscript  
in the Supplement to Palæoromaica.  
By W. G. Broughton, M.A. Curate of  
Hartley Wespall, in Hampshire. 8vo.  
2s.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The Rev. Dr. Russel, of Leith, is  
preparing for the Press two Octavo  
Volumes, to fill in the interval between  
the Works of Shuckford and Prideaux,  
"On the Sacred and Profane History  
of the World connected." It is well  
known that the former of these writers  
meant to bring down his "Con-  
nection" to the period at which Dean  
Prideaux commenced his learned work  
on the same subject, but that he was  
prevented by death from accomplish-  
ing his undertaking. His narrative

ends with the demise of Joshua; and  
the seven hundred years, which elapse  
from that date to the reign of Ahaz,  
constitute the historical field which  
Dr. Russel has announced his intention  
to occupy. His work is expected in  
the course of the present year.

A Volume of Sermons, translated  
by the Rev. Dr. Luscombe, from the  
French, of Protestant Continental Di-  
vines, is in the Press, and will appear  
in a few weeks.

## NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Socius" will appear in another Number.

E. D's. reply to "Justus" has been received; but we do not think it expe-  
dient to continue the discussion.

We have looked over the communication of P. C. in which he objects to the  
"Form for admitting Converts," &c. inserted in our Number for December,  
p. 737, as an innovation on our Liturgy, which he considers has already provided  
for such an occasion in the Baptismal Service appointed for such as have been  
privately baptized. Now, besides that such a service does not apply to a con-  
vert from the Church of Rome, whom we must consider as *already publicly re-  
ceived* "into the congregation of Christ's flock," as well as baptized, we beg to  
inform P. C. that the form which we inserted, is an authorized one, having been  
set forth in the 13th of Queen Anne, in the year 1714, when Tenison was Arch-  
bishop of Canterbury, as may be seen by a reference to "Wilkins's Concilia,"  
vol. iv. p. 660. There are a few omissions in the form as we have printed it,  
which ought not to have been. For after the exhortation a Psalm is appointed  
to be read—the 119th, at verse 161. Then a Lesson—Luke xv. to ver. 8.  
And after that two other Psalms—the 115th, to verse 10, when the penitent  
comes from the Church of Rome; or, instead of that, the 122d, if the penitent  
comes from "the separation."